DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 212 RC 023 852

AUTHOR	Ancess, Jacqueline; Ort, Suzanna Wichterle
TITLE	How the Coalition Campus Schools Have Re-Imagined High School: Seven Years Later.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, NY. Teachers Coll. National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.
PUB DATE	1999-03-00
NOTE	106p
AVAILABLE FROM	NCREST, Box 110, Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th St., New York, NY 10027 ($12.00). For full text: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/ ~ncrest/aera.ancess.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; Educational Environment; *Educational Practices; Graduation Rate; High Schools; House Plan; *Outcomes of Education; Partnerships in Education; Performance Based Assessment; Program Evaluation; *School Restructuring; Small Classes; *Small Schools; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Coalition of Essential Schools; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

In 1992, a collaboration of educational reform organizations, the New York City Board of Education, a teachers' union, and private funders created a model of urban high school reform that was practitioner-driven. Two failing high schools, one in Manhattan and one in the Bronx, were phased out while 11 new, small autonomous high schools were created. Some of the new schools moved into the big buildings, which were reconceived as multi-age, multi-use campuses, while others remained external. After 7 years, an evaluation collected data via 86 interviews with students, teachers, and administrators; observations of 15 classrooms, 14 portfolio presentations, and 16 administrative meetings; and a review of project documents. Among the findings are that in 1998 the five schools in the Manhattan cohort had the highest graduation rate and the lowest dropout rate among the New York City high school reform models, with 89 percent of graduates attending college. Small school size (300-400 students) and small classes enabled teachers to support the most educationally needy students. Each school had multiple mechanisms that enabled teachers to know students well and help them succeed. Each school developed a performance assessment system using multiple instruments. Findings concerning school governance, accountability, pedagogy, board-school relationships, budgetary allocations, and practitioner-driven reform are presented. (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 473 212

How the Coalition Campus Schools Have Re-imagined High School: Seven Years Later

Jacqueline Ancess
Suzanna Wichterle Ort

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jacqueline Ancess
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST)
Teachers College, Columbia University
March, 1999

RC 023852

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Executive Summary is organized into 7 sections: 1) the vision of the project, 2) number and location of schools, 3) description of the campuses, 4) student outcomes, 5) significant organizational and pedagogical school practices, 6) promising campus practices, and 7) lessons about practitioner-driven reform.

The Vision of the Project

Launched in 1992 as a collaboration among the Center for Collaborative Education (CCE), the Coalition of Essential Schools, the New York City Board of Education, the United Federation of Teachers, and a variety of private funders, the Coalition Campus Schools Project (CCSP) is inching its way toward creating a model of urban high school reform by transforming two large comprehensive urban high schools from failure to success. Led by former secondary school principals, Deborah Meier and Marcia Brevot in collaboration with CCE colleagues from Central Park East Secondary School, International HS, Satellite Academy, University Heights HS, and the Urban Academy, the CCS Project used a Asmall school strategy≅ and practitioner expertise to drive the reform.

First in 1992 and then in 1993 two failing high schools, Julia Richman in Manhattan and James Monroe in the Bronx, began a three year phase out at the same time 11 new, small autonomous high schools were created, six in Manhattan, four in the Bronx, and one in Brooklyn. The new schools were *hot-housed*, beginning their lives and development in spaces outside the big high school buildings. Eventually some of the new schools would move back into the big buildings while others would remain in external spaces.

The two large high school buildings were reconceived as multi-age, multi-use complexes known as a campuses. In addition to some of the new, small, autonomous Ahot housed≅ high schools, the campus blueprint includes a K-8 elementary school, an infant-toddler program, a teacher center, a medical clinic, and possibly other educational service organizations. Each school is organizationally, fiscally, and instructionally independent and autonomous, true to its own vision of education for its students. Each school has dedicated classroom and office space

and all schools share some spaces such as the library, cafeteria, and gymnasium. The CCS Project envisioned building governance by a council comprised of the leaders of each school and council and building coordination by a building manager.

Number and Location of Schools

Seven years after the project was launched, all 11 of the schools are thriving and 10 are still in the Project. In the Manhattan cohort, Vanguard and Manhattan International High Schools reside at the Julia Richman Campus while the Coalition School for Social Change, Landmark HS, and Manhattan Village Academy have their own spaces in other buildings. In the Bronx, the Bronx Coalition Community School for Technology is located at the James Monroe Campus, while Brooklyn International HS, Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom HS, the New School for Arts & Sciences, and Wings Academy are in external spaces.

Description of the Campuses

Sharing the campuses are other schools and educational service organizations. At Julia Richman, there are a total of six schools including the Urban Academy a 12 year old CCE member, Talent Unlimited, a performing arts school once a program at the original Julia Richman HS, the newly created Ella Baker K-8 school, and P226M, a special education middle school for autistic youngsters. Four of the schools belong to the Alternative High School Superintendency, one to the Manhattan Superintendency, and one to the Special Education Superintendency. Mt. Sinai Hospital has a medical center at the Campus and the Maxine Greene Arts Center provides gallery and performing arts space. The First Steps LYFE (Living for the Young Family through Education) Center provides day care for the infants and toddlers of students at the campus= various schools, education in parenting, and professional development for New York City school-based day care centers. A Teen Parent Resource Center provides professional development and learning opportunities on infant and toddler care and development for staff and parents affiliated with NYC BOE school-based child care programs. Lastly at the Richman Campus is the Center for Inquiry in Teaching and Learning, a teacher center that engages urban educators in professional development workshops, seminars, and discussions on

issues that confront them and their schools.

At the James Monroe Campus there are three high schools: Monroe Academy for Business & Law, the Monroe Academy for Visual Arts & Design, and World Cultures High School in addition to Bronx Coalition Community School for Technology. Additionally, there is a LYFE Center and a health center in the building. In the planning phase are an elementary school scheduled to open in September 1999, a teacher center, an art gallery, and an adult literacy center.

At the Richman Campus, the building manager, who is the co-director of the Urban Academy, chairs weekly Building Council meetings attended by the leaders of the campus= schools and programs. Governance is by consensus. At the Monroe Campus, a campus director oversees the coordination of the building and works with each of the high schools. Decisions at the Monroe Campus are made in collaboration with the Alternative High Schools superintendent.

Student Outcomes

X The 1998 graduation rate for the 5 schools in the Manhattan Cohort is the highest among the New York City high school reform models;

X The 1998 dropout rate for the 5 schools in the Manhattan Cohort is the lowest among the high school reform models and is almost half that of the city=s;

X A random sample of 1998 Manhattan Cohort graduates reveals a college going rate of 89%.

Significant Organizational and Pedagogical School Practices

X Small School Size: the school populations range from 300 to 400 students; small school and class size enables teachers to provide the most educationally needy students with the support necessary for them to engage challenging curriculum;

X Innovative School Organization: Manhattan and Brooklyn International High Schools are modeled on International High School at LaGuardia Community College; the other schools are modeled on Central Park East Secondary. Each of

the schools has developed customized adaptations to meet its particular goals;

X Relationships and Personal Responsibility are key strategies for students= academic and social development and success. Each school has multiple mechanisms that enable teachers to know students well, to closely monitor their progress, and to provide academic and social supports and interventions necessary for success;

X School as an Intellectual Community: schools are designed and developed to be intellectual communities; curriculum, instruction, and assessment focus on intellectual development by requiring students to construct knowledge and engage in disciplined inquiry and by designing tasks that have value beyond school[1]. Professional development is integral to teacher development and is primarily provided from within schools or their networks. Teachers learn from one another and their practice;

X Performance Assessments: Each school has developed a performance assessment system that enables teachers and students to assess their work using multiple indicators and multiple instruments and that facilitates continuous improvement.

Promising Campus Practices

X Campus self-governance: The Julia Richman Campus is governed by a Building Council, which is composed of the leaders of each of the schools and programs in the building and which meets weekly. They have developed a consensus model of self-governance that effectively manages the building, supports personalization and individual school autonomy, fosters cross-school cooperation, collaboration, and problem-solving, and has increased building safety and security while eliminating scanners;

X Individual school autonomy: Individual school autonomy supports effective

---

[1]These characteristics refer to standards for authentic achievement in *Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality,* Fred Newmann & Assoc., 1996, Jossey-Bass.

school development and facilitates cross-school cooperation and collaboration. At both the Richman and Monroe Campuses, schools have developed independently and designated areas for collaboration including sports, student government;

X Anchor School: At the Julia Richman Campus the maturity of the Urban Academy enabled it to take major responsibility for building-wide issues, permitting newer schools to focus more on their development;

X Building manager: The conceptualization of the building manager as a facilitator and an administrative coordinator who implements the decisions of the Building Council has supported individual school development, cross school trust, cooperation, collaboration, and commitment to the success of the campus;

X Mixed-age and mixed-use campus: At the Julia Richman Campus, all schools report on the student and staff benefits of cross-school interactions and from the services offered in the building.

Lessons about Practitioner-Driven Reform

X Accountability as Commitment: The Campus model demonstrates that practitioner-driven reform can generate a high level of professional commitment and accountability to high standards of performance for students and schools.

X The Relationship between the Intermediary Agency, the Campus, and the Schools: Support for practitioner-driven reform requires intermediary agencies to negotiate their role and authority with schools, in order to avoid competition, conflict, and mistrust. When intermediary agencies compromise their support of schools in exchange for access to local education agencies, they alienate schools .

X The Relationship between the Local Education Authority, the Campus, and the Schools: Support for this new model of high school reform requires the BOE to formulate new policies with regard to building and school self-governance, school size, student enrollment, and safeguards against administrative discontinuities; it requires the BOE to negotiate a new regulatory relationship with the campus and

with individual schools that emphasizes support, technical assistance, and collaboration rather than monitoring; in other words, new model schools require new model school systems;

X Budgetary Allocations Appropriate to the Campus Model: The BOE needs to develop an allocation formula to support campus model of reform so that there are sufficient funds for the necessary resources, staffing positions, and proper management of the campus.

How the Coalition Campus Schools Have Re-imagined High School: Seven Years Later

Introduction

In 1992 and 1993, the Center for Collaborative Education (CCE), the New York City affiliate of the national Coalition of Essential Schools (CES), collaborated with the New York City Board of Education and CES on the Coalition Campus Schools Project (CCSP), which was co-directed by Deborah Meier and Dr. Marcia Brevot. The intent of the CCS Project was two-fold, to pilot a model for transforming the large urban neighborhood high school, which was failing students at ever higher rates, and to create a new model of secondary school education in the image of what CCE member high schools knew provided vulnerable and under-served urban youngsters with an intellectually powerful education. This would be a school and system level reform initiative driven by practitioner-knowledge and by practitioners who would have increased autonomy in exchange for increased accountability. With the support of the United Federation of Teachers and funding from a number of foundations, the CCE/CES/BOE collaboration planned what Meier called a "small school strategy" to transform two large, failing New York City zoned high schools. The launching of this initiative, documented in an earlier NCREST report, *Inching Toward Reform: How the Coalition Campus Schools Are Re-inventing High School* (Darling-Hammond, Ancess, McGregor, & Zuckerman, 1997), involved phasing out two big high schools while creating eleven small, autonomous high schools in external sites. As space in the big buildings became available, some, but not all, of these "hot-housed," new, autonomous small schools would return to the large buildings, which would be redesigned as a multi-age, multi-use educational campuses. Not only did the innovative, seasoned practitioners leading this work know that high schools could be different from the factory model that

dominated the education landscape, they knew that the formidable and forbidding big buildings, which they re-imagined as campuses, could be transformed as well.

This report follows up seven years later to find out what has happened to the schools, the campuses, and the students. It focuses on six areas: 1) student outcomes, 2) significant school practices, 3) what the campuses look like and how they function, 4) internal and external tensions related to project implementation, 5) CCE's role in the post-launching phase of the project, and 6) implications for replication. The report is organized into 9 sections: 1) introduction, 2) methodology, 3) update on the 11 schools, 4) student outcomes, 5) significant school practices, 6) what the campuses looks like and how they function, 7) implementation tensions, 8) the role of CCE, and 9) conclusion.

Methodology

We used both qualitative and quantitative methods to address the following research questions:

1. What difference does the CCE/CCS Project appear to make in terms of student outcomes?

2. What school and educational practices appear to affect student outcomes?

3. What role and function do the Center for Collaborative Education and its principles play in the model's initiation, implementation, stability and in influencing the system?

4. What system, campus, and school level tensions does the model evoke and what are the effects?

5. What are the implications for replication?

We used three primary data collection methods to address these questions:

1. semi-structured individual or group interviews with students, teachers, and school, campus, and BOE administrators;

2. observations of classrooms, schools, building council meetings, school staff meetings, CCE meetings, and network meetings; and

3. review of student, teacher, school, CCE, BOE, and project documents such as samples of student portfolios, student transcripts, curriculum, schedules, meeting notes, e-mail exchanges, superintendents' communications to schools, and BOE reports.

Principals selected the teachers and students whom we interviewed. Students interviewed reflected an academic cross-section of their school and teachers interviewed and observed represented a range of grade levels and experience. All participated voluntarily.

We conducted a total of 86 interviews with 8 campus administrators, 10 school administrators from 9 schools, 28 teachers from 7 schools, 31 students from 7 schools, and 4 BOE officials. We observed 15 classes in 6 schools, 14 portfolio presentations in 6 schools, 3 Julia Richman Building Council meetings, 7 faculty meetings at 5 schools, 2 CCE meetings--one on admissions and one on performance assessments, 3 network meetings, and 1 cross-network meeting on performance assessments.

Data collection occurred from September 1997 thorough November 1998. Documentation in schools occurred from February 1998 through November 1998. The New School for Arts and Science withdrew from the study in January 1998 with the principal citing her "general distrust of researchers." The Bronx Coalition Community School for Technology participated sporadically in the research. The principal of Wings Academy suspended the school's participation in the research in the fall of 1998, citing "unresolved conflicts" between CCE and NCREST. NCREST was never informed of the nature of the unresolved conflicts. Earlier, in July 1998, the executive co-directors of CCE moved to immediately terminate their contract for the research with NCREST. Although NCREST made several requests for a written explanation for this action, none was provided. NCREST decided to complete the research if it

was the will of the majority of the schools. The majority of schools chose to continue to participate in the research citing its importance to their work. In December 1998, the CCE executive co-directors agreed to support the completion of the research.

We coded and triangulated the multiple sources of data according to categories derived from the goals stated in the research design: 1) the implementation of the campus design and CCE principles, 2) internal and external supports and tensions with regard to the development of the schools and the campuses, 3) significant practices with regard to teaching and learning, and 4) significant issues with regard to school and campus development. The analysis of the data proceeded from the evidence assembled from each category. Themes emerging from the data in each of the categories were integrated into the narrative. For example, the themes of commitment to collaboration, Board of Education ambivalence toward the project, and the importance of small size schools and classes, which emerged from the data, are integrated into the report.

Member checks were conducted at each of the schools in the study to ensure accuracy. Revisions were made accordingly. A draft of the report was reviewed by individuals internal and external to NCREST and the Project. The internal reviewers included the Co-Director of NCREST and a Project principal. The external reviewers include two secondary school principals, who are CCE members but not involved in the project, and two education researchers from other institutions of higher education. Changes were made on the basis of their feedback. Names of school faculty members are used in conjunction with their statements only where permission was granted.

We attempted to conduct a student-outcome comparison study to ascertain the

educational and social effects of the Project on students. The student effects we sought to examine include: attendance rates, graduation rates, college enrollment rates, course passing rates in English language arts and mathematics, highest level mathematics course-taking rates, and incident rates. Except at the two International High Schools which were not included in the student outcomes study because no comparison schools for them exist in the New York City school system, we selected a random sample of 20 students from each school's 1994-95 9th grade cohort. In our selection of the sample, we categorized students according to the variables of age, gender, and race. We gave the stratified sample to the Board of Education with the request that they create a comparison sample from high schools comparable to the schools in the Project. Although the BOE agreed to provide the comparison sample and the data sets for the variables we requested, they did not provide them. In anticipation of this result, we requested some of these data from the schools in the student outcomes study. Five of the schools assembled the data sets we requested. We collected data on attendance, graduation rates, course passing rates in mathematics, highest level mathematics course-taking rates, and college admission rates.

These data are aggregated by borough cohort so that outcomes for Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom HS are reported separately from the outcomes for the Coalition School for Social Change, Landmark, Manhattan Village Academy, and Vanguard. (Other schools in the Bronx cohort did not submit data for their sample.) Although we analyze these outcomes, without a comparison data set, we cannot compare the student effects of the CCE/CCSP schools to the student effects of comparable, non-CCE/CCSP member schools.

Update on the Eleven Schools

There were six schools in the first CCE/CCSP cohort and five in the second. The

development of first cohort corresponded to the phase-out of Julia Richman High School in Manhattan and the second cohort to the phase-out of James Monroe High School in the Bronx. Of the six Julia Richman schools, five, the Coalition School for Social Change (CSSC), Landmark High School, Manhattan International High School (MIHS), Manhattan Village Academy (MVA), and Vanguard High School are still members of the Project. The sixth school, Legacy High School for Integrated Studies, withdrew from the Project. All five schools in the second cohort, Brooklyn International High School (BIHS), Bronx Coalition Community School for Technology, Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom High School, the New School for Arts & Science, and Wings Academy still participate in the Project. Except at the Coalition School for Social Change and Fannie Lou Hamer, the founding principals continue to lead the schools. A new principal, who is also new to CCE/CES principles, has just been appointed to CSSC. Fannie Lou, which is in the process of a search for a permanent principal, is being led by an interim principal who was previously an assistant principal at Middle College High School which is a CCE/CES school and has a commitment to its educational principles. Two other schools, MIHS and Vanguard have chosen to be led by two co-directors.

Three of the schools are located in the former large high schools: MIHS and Vanguard are located in what is now called the Julia Richman Education Complex (JREC) and Bronx Community Coalition is located at the James Monroe Education Complex. The other schools either have their own, newly designed space or share newly designed space with a second school. CSSC and Landmark share a building. Brooklyn International shares a building with the Science Skills Center for Science, Technology, and the Arts, a secondary school which is not a member of CCE. Manhattan Village Academy shares a building with other establishments that

are not schools. Fannie Lou Hamer and Wings are located in their own space. The New School for Arts and Science was originally located in the Monroe Complex but moved into a junior high school building which it shares with a junior high school.

Many of the schools stay connected as members of networks that belong to the New York City Annenberg Challenge, New York Networks for School Reform. Brooklyn and Manhattan International belong to the International High Schools Partnership with their mentor school, International HS at LaGuardia Community College. CSSC, Landmark, and Manhattan Village Academy formed the Campus Schools Network. Bronx Coalition Community, Fannie Lou, the New School, and Wings along with Central Park East Secondary School formed the Bronx & CPESS Network. Vanguard is a member of the Julia Richman Coalition Campus School Complex Network along with four other CCE schools, two of which are also located in the Julia Richman Complex.

Student Outcomes

As explained in the methodology section, in order to determine the effects of the Project on students' academic and social outcomes, we designed a study in which we would compare the outcomes of students in project schools with a matched sample of students in comparable schools. We constructed a random sample of approximately 20 students in the 9th grade 1994-1995 cohort from each of the CCE/CCSP schools, except the International schools for whom there are no comparable schools in the New York City school system. As mentioned in the methodology section, we stratified the sample for three variables--gender, race, and date of birth--and requested a matched sample and data sets from the Board of Education. Simultaneously, we collected another data set from schools. Since the BOE did not produce either the matched

sample or the data sets we requested, the following findings reflect only the outcomes from the schools who provided us with data: Coalition School for Social Change, Landmark High School, Manhattan Village Academy, and Vanguard High School from the Manhattan cohort and Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom High School from the Bronx cohort. Because Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom High School is not part of the Manhattan cohort, we have reported their data separately.

Findings on the Manhattan Cohort

From our student-outcomes study for the 9th grade, 1994-95 Manhattan Cohort, we found that in 1998, 71% of the students in the random sample (n=77) graduated within 4 years; 21% continued for at least one additional semester at their school to complete their school's requirements for graduation; 8% transferred or moved. Schools reported no lost students or school drop-outs from the sample.

Manhattan Cohort
1998 Graduation Rate for Students in the 1994 Cohort

N=77	Frequency	Percent
Graduated	55	71%
Extension	16	21%
Moved Out/Transfer	6	8%

The Manhattan cohort's graduation rate is approximately double the 1992 Julia Richman High School graduation rate, which was 36.9%[2].

[2] *1992-1993 School Profile and School Performance in Relation to Minimum Standards,*

The rate of graduates in the random sample who went on to college the semester following graduation is 89%.

College Going Rate

Sample 1994 cohort students who graduated and enrolled in college in 1998.

	Total N	Frequency	Percent
1998 Graduates Enrolled in College	56	50	89%

The average SAT mathematics score for the students in the sample is 387 with a maximum score of 550 and a minimum score of 210. The average SAT verbal score for the students in the sample is 374 with a maximum score of 660 and a minimum score of 200.

SAT Scores

N=49	Mean Score	Min. Score	Max. Score
Math	387	210	550
Verbal	374	200	660

Mathematics course passing: On average, students take and pass 7 semester-long mathematics courses prior to graduation. In effect, students take and pass 3 ½ years of mathematics which exceeds the state and city requirements. Analysis of course-taking and passing patterns reveals that the most frequently taken and passed mathematics course is pre-

---

published by the New York City Public Schools.

calculus, the second is algebra, the third is geometry, and the fourth is trigonometry, and the fifth is integrated algebra and geometry. These data indicate the schools' commitment to a rigorous, college preparatory curriculum.

Mathematics Course- Taking and Passing
Courses taken and passed as of 1998 by students in the 1994 cohort.

N=77	Mean	Min.	Max.
#Math Classes Taken and Passed	7	1	9

Highest Level Math
Highest level of math taken and passed as of 1998 by 1994 cohort.

N=77	Frequency	Percent
Pre Calculus	25	33%
Algebra	14	18%
Geometry	19	25%
Trigonometry	11	14%
Integrated Algebra/geometry	8	10%

The average daily attendance rate of the students in the random sample is 92%. That means on average, 15 days absence per year.

Attendance Rates
Average number of days absence across schools.

N=75	Mean Days Absent	% Average Daily Attendance
	15	92%

Bronx Cohort

From our student-outcomes study for Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom High School• s 9th grade entering 1994-95, we found that in 1998, 55% of the students in the random sample (n=20) graduated within 4 years; 30% continued for at least one additional semester at their school to complete their school's requirements for graduation; 15% transferred or moved. The school reported no lost students or school drop-outs. Fannie Lou Hamer's graduation rate is double the 1992 James Monroe High School graduation rate, which prior to closing was 26.9%[3].

1998 Graduation Rate for Students in the 1994 Cohort

N=20	Frequency	Percent
Graduated	11	55%
Extension	6	30%
Moved Out/Transfer	3	15%

Data on the rate of graduates in the random sample who went on to college the semester following graduation were not available.

The average SAT mathematics score for the students in the sample is 324 with a maximum score of 390 and a minimum score of 210. The average SAT verbal score for the students in the sample is 341 with a maximum score of 550 and a minimum score of 200.

[3] *1992-1993 School Profile and School Performance in Relation to Minimum Standards*, published by the New York City Public Schools.

SAT Scores

N=9	Mean Score	Min. Score	Max. Score
Math	324	210	390
Verbal	341	200	550

Mathematics course passing: On average, students take and pass 6 semester-long mathematics courses prior to graduation. In effect, students take and pass 3 years of mathematics. These data indicate the school's commitment to a rigorous, college preparatory curriculum. Analysis of course-taking and passing patterns reveals that the most frequently taken and passed mathematics course is algebra, the second is trigonometry, the third is pre-algebra, and the fourth is integrated algebra and geometry.

Mathematics Course Taking and Passing
Courses taken and passed by students in the 1994 cohort, as of 1998

N=20	Mean	Min.	Max.
#Math Classes Taken and Passed	6	2	10

Highest Level Math
Highest level math taken and passed by students in the 1994 cohort as of 1998

N=19	Frequency	Percent
Algebra	14	74%
Trigonometry	2	11%
Pre-Algebra	2	11%
Integrated Algebra/geometry	1	5%

The average daily attendance rate of the students in the random sample is 90%. That means on average, 18 days absence per year.

Attendance Rates
Average number of days absence.

N=19	Mean Days Absent	% Average Daily Attendance
	18	90%

College Enrollment of CCE/CCSP Graduates

Among the four-year colleges CCE/CCSP schools' graduates attend are: Alfred University, Bard College, Barnard College, Baruch College, Brooklyn College, Casenovia College, City College of New York, Connecticut College, Dominican College, Dowling College, Hampshire College, Hobart & Smith College, Hunter College, John Jay College. Lehman College, Long Island University, Manhattanville College, Marymount College, Pace University,

Renssalaer Polytechnic Institute, Sacred Heart College, St. John• s University, South Carolina State University, South Hampton College, Touro College, Union College, Vassar College, Virginia Union College, and the State University of New York at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo College, Cobleskill, Cortland, Farmingdale, Morrisville, New Paltz, Oneonta, and Oswego. Among the two year colleges students attend are: Borough of Manhattan Community College, Hostos, Kingsborough, LaGuardia, Queensborough, and Sullivan County Community College.

Comparison of Graduation Rates Across High School Reforms

Over the last 10 years, the New York City school system has implemented four models for reforming failing high schools: the CCE/CCS Project, Andrew Jackson, Erasmus, and Wadleigh. Each model involves the creation of new smaller autonomous or semi- autonomous schools that occupy the same building which originally housed a single high school that was phased out because of low student performance rates. The Jackson and Erasmus schools began inside the large building. The Wadleigh and CCE/CCS schools began autonomously in sites separate from the large building. All of the Wadleigh schools moved into the renovated Wadleigh building and became semi-autonomous with a single building principal overseeing all of them. Two of the six Manhattan CCE/CCSP schools moved into the Julia Richman building. All of these new schools have graduated at least one class of students. We have aggregated their graduation rates by reform model.

Comparison of 1997 Graduation Rates Across High School Reforms and Their Superintendencies

Comparison of Student Four Year Graduation Rates for the 1997 Class				
High School	**N**	**Mean % Graduated**	**Mean % Dropped Out**	**Mean % Still Enrolled**
Manhattan CCSP (6)[4]	369	**46.23**	**8.02**	**45.75**
Andrew Jackson (4)	340	42.21	10.66	47.27
Erasmus (3)	375	38.18	9.73	52.08
Wadleigh (4)	113	38.05	15.93	46.02
Manhattan Sup.[5]	9517	55.16	12	32.84
Queens Sup.	14364	58.60	9.56	31.93
Brooklyn Sup.	9968	60.32	9.25	30.43
Alternative Sup.	1321	48.52	7.80	43.68
		% Graduated	**% Dropped Out**	**% Still Enrolled**

[4]The number in the parenthesis next to the name of each high school complex represents the number of autonomous new high schools in the reform, except for Wadleigh whose 4 schools are not autonomous. Wadleigh is a 7th-12th grade school; the others are 9th-12th grade schools.

[5]Sup.=Superintendency

Comparison of Student Four Year Graduation Rates for the 1997 Class					
City		66,703	**48.4**	**15.9**	**35.7**

(Division of Assessment and Accountability, NYC Board of Education, 1997).

The Manhattan CCE/CCSP cohort's graduation rate is the highest among the high school reform models. There is no statistical difference between the Manhattan CCE/CCSP cohort and the city-wide graduation rate. The dropout rate of the Manhattan CCE/CCSP cohort is almost half that of the city's, is the lowest among the high school reform models, and is lower than the mean for the borough superintendencies to which the other reforms belong as well as the Manhattan superintendency. Statistically, there is no difference between the mean drop-out rate of the Manhattan CCE/CCSP schools and the Alternative High Schools superintendency, of which the schools are a part. All of the reforms have a higher continued enrollment rate than the city or the superintendencies.

Significant School Practices

In this section we will discuss school organization and school practices in three areas that prior research finds to be significant for school success (Lee, Smith, & Croninger, 1995; Newmann & Associates, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Ancess, 1997). These areas are 1) small school size, 2) relationships, and 3) the design and development of school as an intellectual community.

Organization

The ten schools in the Julia Richman and James Monroe cohorts are between 300 and 400 in size. Except for the two International schools, their structural and curricular organizations are variations on the model of Central Park East Secondary School (CPESS), which reflects the

influence of Deborah Meier who was their principal mentor and who oversaw the launching and early development of the schools. The International schools follow the model of their mentor school, International High School at LaGuardia Community College in Long Island City, led by Eric Nadelstern. As at CPESS, teachers in the new schools work in interdisciplinary teams with a small, constant group of approximately 80 students to whom they teach a college preparatory, core curriculum framed around habits of mind. In the 9th and 10th grades, some schools schedule separate humanities and math/science blocks of time, which extend beyond the conventional 40 minutes. Some of the schools are making customized adaptations such as uncoupling math and science in order to strengthen mathematics instruction and learning. In the 11th and 12th grades, some of the schools have developed variations on CPESS' Senior Institute, which prepares students for the performance assessments they will need in order to graduate and into which students enter after they demonstrate their mastery of prior grade requirements. The principal of one of the schools in the Bronx cohort described the variation in organization at her school:

> Students are organized into five houses. One house is ninth grade only. One house is seniors only. Three houses are mixed groups. Each house has a math/science component, a humanities component, and an additional component [i.e., such as arts]. We have four levels of students: 1) Beginnings, 2) Journeys 1, 3) Journeys 2, and 4) Senior Institute. Teachers are organized by house and discipline.

At the International schools, teachers also work in interdisciplinary teams called thematic clusters, class periods are also longer that the conventional 40 minutes, and performance assessments are integral to the clusters. Students stay with a cluster for a year and must satisfy the requirements of each class in the cluster in order to receive a passing grade. Others of the schools have integrated the performance assessments throughout the four years students are at the school. Principal Joan Perez described the variation at Wings Academy:

> The portfolio here is a 4-year process. Students are required to document what they know and are able to do on a yearly basis. Each year, students must pull work from their class portfolio to put in their school portfolio. The first year - Form 1 or 9th Grade - components are assigned. Students must give a demonstration of their library skills, an annotated bibliography--25 sources, an essay--either persuasive or reflective, a research paper, proficiency in math and science--which can be defined by the grade each year as a project, a series of teacher-referenced tests, or a design of an experiment, and an academic review-- a narrative about how well they've learned a number of concepts that have been taught over a period of a year. Our curriculum gives them opportunities to do those kinds of things over a period of a year so that they can select out from the individual class portfolio a piece of work that means a lot to them, that has sufficient content, and that meets certain English language arts standards. They must take that piece of work and present it to a committee.

At Manhattan Village Academy, each grade has a particular focus with a performance assessment attached to it. Students' course work is aligned to projects and oral defenses. As MVA develops and refines its instructional program, founding principal, Mary Butz, comments that the school is "in a process of reflecting on CCE/Coalition framework."

All of the schools implement an advisory, family group, or house system, which enables faculty to keep close tabs on students socially and academically. All are committed to inquiry and project-based pedagogy and practice it to varying degrees, depending on faculty capacity and perspective. All implement an external learning experience comprised of community service, internships, or apprenticeships.

All of the schools implement a performance-based assessment system and require students to complete a set of 7 or more portfolios in major and minor subject areas for graduation. All of the performance assessment systems share some common components: 1) oral presentation by the candidate before a committee of teachers and a peer whose function is to question for in depth understanding and to assess the entire portfolio's quality for graduation, 2) a written and sometimes constructed or performed product requiring in-depth study, 3) a rating

scale to assess the students' product and oral presentation, and 4) a rubric that embodies the set of standards, often known as habits of mind, against which students' product and performance are judged. In order to graduate, each student's committee must pass on their entire set of portfolios, with the result that in all of the schools, some students take more than four years to graduate.

Across the schools, there are variations in the number of portfolios required, their sequence, time lines for completion, their content and specific requirements, the rubrics, criteria for judgment, and course requirements. Performance and content standards have been deemed by the New York State Education Department as compatible with state standards. Currently, but about to expire, there is a waiver from the Regents Competency Tests (other than math, reading, and writing) granted to the schools by the former Education Commissioner. In order to extend the current arrangement, seven of the Project schools have joined the New York Performance Standards Consortium, a state wide organization of schools seeking a variance from the new Regents exams and adopted a collaboratively developed protocol that they hope the state will accept as an alternative to a new set of Regents exams to be required of all students for high school graduation. For the same purpose, four of the Project schools have adopted a protocol they developed with CCE. The Chancellor and the Board of Education have been actively supporting this initiative by negotiating with the state and by funding assessment development work.

Small School Size

All of the individuals we encountered in this study emphasized the importance of small school size. The benefits they cited confirm current research (Darling-Hammond, Ancess, &

Falk, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Ancess, 1997; Gladden, 1998): increased safety, the absence of violence, increased student access to teachers for academic as well as personal support, increased opportunities for teachers to know students and one another well, increased opportunities for faculty to collaborate on behalf of students, and increased opportunities for timely interventions to prevent students from falling through the cracks. A student at Landmark commented, "There is less violence compared to bigger schools. Everyone knows one another. You don't want to mess with them. Bigger schools are louder and crazier. No one will bother you here."

Another said, "I've been here for 4 years and I haven't seen a fight."

Another student commented, "We mediate here. Problems seem childish here."

A fourth student remarked, "Teachers can catch on to problems before they get bad."

Melissa Chumpitaz, a Vanguard math/science teacher who has been teaching for three years confirmed the safety felt by students at the Project schools: "There is safety here. Students will come to me and say, 'I have a problem with . . . and I want to talk it out.' They don't fight."

Vanguard humanities teacher, Nancy Gonzalez, commented on what she called "the family feeling." She said, "You are just not going to fall through the cracks here. You are an important individual. For the first time, [students] are seen as important individuals in the school system. I compare this with my experience in large schools with 35 students in a class, where kids fall through the cracks."

The low student-teacher ratio and small size classes provide teachers with the conditions necessary to assign and support intellectually challenging work and to sustain demands for quality performance. Linda Brown, who has 22 years of teaching experience, the last four of

which have been as a humanities teacher at Vanguard, explains:

> Small size means I can do a literature seminar with the bottom 20% of kids in the city. I can have them write short essays on works like, *Of Mice and Men.* Kids who didn't read are reading books like *Jane Eyre* to write their essay. We can work with them during lunch. You find out who can't read, type, etc. These are the kids who would sit in the back of the room, be in the bathroom, and would deliberately get lost. You couldn't do this work if you had 150 kids. I know dedicated teachers in big schools who teach 150 kids. They can't do this.

At Manhattan Village Academy, this point is expressed from the students' perspective: "This school will get the worst student to do the work. Teachers are not like this at other high schools where they have 100 kids. Troubled kids need attention and they can get it here. Kids can see other kids like them working."

A 27 year high school history teacher who has been at Vanguard for 5 years, explains that the school's small size influences his pedagogy:

> I can use in-depth approaches and assign college level research projects. For 2 months, each morning, we teach students research skills and essay skills so that they can do a minimum 20-page research paper in history. I give them internal motivation to come up against the challenge. They choose the topic. We develop their topic together. We develop an angle to the topic. This gets them into the different sides of the topic. They are stimulated and internally motivated because it is something they want to learn. I take them to the Donnell Library. First I call the librarian and she gets books on their topics together. They browse through different books, take notes, and order their thoughts in an outline. The whole process is new and overwhelming to them. All of this is challenging. Then, the kids have to listen to their teachers and peers criticizing their work. Then they have to rewrite. They have to cite references, show evidence, and prove their thesis.

Nancy Mann, teacher at Fannie Lou Hamer explained the link between small school size and high standards for student performance:

> It is important to keep schools small in order to socialize students into taking on more rigorous academic demands. Portfolios motivate older students but the ninth graders think it is torture. Teachers need to spend more time with students, which they do. But that is wearing when you have a lot of kids.

Small size and low student-teacher ratio--approximately 20 students per class-- claim

teachers at Brooklyn International, increase the time they have to work closely with students and make students their focus. One teacher explained:

> Classes are smaller. Last year we had classes of 25-27. This year it's 20 and it makes a **huge** difference. We can get around to all of the kids, to all of the groups. You know more than their names. We know lots of stuff about the kids--who they are. Attendance is not a problem. Kids attend regularly.

Another teacher at Brooklyn International explained the benefits of the low student-teacher ratio in the team organization:

> Teams see about 75-80 students so it is easier to keep track of kids. We know them all. It's easy to communicate among teachers about kids. In my other school you didn't talk about kids. You didn't know who else they had. You saw them for 40 minutes per day and that was it. Here you share strategies and figure out how to help kids together.

Manhattan International students commented on the increased attention afforded them by the small size of the school: "We only have two hundred or so students. So we can ask questions. We and teachers are very close."

At Landmark, small size makes reciprocal learning possible between teachers and students. Two students explained that there is "mutual teaching." One said, "Teachers learn from reading the students' papers whether you got what you were supposed to get and then they know how to help you." Small size enables teachers to assign projects so that they have the opportunities to know what students do and do not understand.

At Manhattan Village Academy, a student explained how small size school affects teachers• opportunities to influence students: "We develop a strong relationship with teachers. There are not too many kids in the school, so we are in direct contact with teachers. It has a positive influence."

Another MVA student explained how small size affects students' opportunities to learn:

"Since classes are small, the teachers break down things for you so that you understand. They correct our exams within a week. They don't just give us a book to read. They don't move on unless they understand exactly what we are doing."

Another said, "They take individual time to sit down with you, to give you practice stuff to do so you get a better understanding, so you don't get stuck. The teachers help you with whatever you need help in..

A student at Coalition School for Social Change expressed the sentiments of most students interviewed. He said, "Because the school is small, teachers have more time to help us. They don't go crazy and we get to learn better. They try to make us learn. They are friendly."

The flexibility small size affords schools to be immediately responsive as exemplified by the ease with which schedules can be changed has important implications for students' opportunities to learn. Brooklyn International's principal, Sara Newman's description of the ease and speed with which a necessary course was developed and scheduled is an apt example of how small size is linked to schools' capacity to increase students' opportunities to learn and succeed with high stakes content:

> Classes did a physics project for which [students] did not understand the math. We talked about it a lot and we decided that we'd add another class to our curriculum. We'd shorten the other classes from 75 minutes to 60 minutes and we'd use that time to have a class called *Support Class*. And it's really to help students who have had interrupted schooling and need extra help. One semester they take language support and another semester they take math support. There is a higher and lower level support class and language doesn't matter. They both do a lot of writing. In that class, they do a lot of process-writing. The lower-level class is working a lot on paragraphs and the upper level class is working more on essays. In the math support class, the kids really need arithmetic skills. They understand really well conceptually, they just can't do calculations. One of our goals for support is not to turn it into a remedial class. So our assumption is that no one is going to be in a lower-level support for four years. And at worst, in a couple of years, they'll move on and be in upper level support classes. This is the first year that every team is doing it.

Size can affect teacher and school development. According to Mann, the BOE's overcrowding of Fannie Lou Hamer destabilized a fragile pedagogical culture that experienced staff were trying to build. Mann explained:

> This is the third year of the eleventh and twelfth grades. Fifty percent of the staff is new. I'm now re-training a third group of people about what is a portfolio. If you grow too big, you lose some of the intellectual intent. You're not building an intellectual base among the teachers or an intellectual field where the teachers are working. You're just constantly introducing the same concept over and over, and the concept itself doesn't particularly grow, because it doesn't have a deep enough medium to do it in.

Relationships

We found that relationships between students and faculty and among faculty and to the work are central. They are the current and the currency of the social and intellectual life of the schools (Ancess, 1997). We found evidence of caring relationships and strong professional relationships, both of which are identified in the research as features of successful schools (Lee, Bryk, & Smith, 1993; McLaughlin, 1995; Newmann & Associates, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Ancess, 1997). As indicated in this research, caring relationships among school community members and to the work can be critical to students' social and educational development. This assertion is confirmed in our findings at Project schools. Over and over, students we interviewed compared their school to a family and coupled their academic achievement with their caring relationships with teachers. One Vanguard student said, "School should not be mass production. It needs to be loving and close. That is what kids need. You need love to learn. Teachers need to love what they do. They shouldn't be teaching otherwise."

At CSSC, a student remarked, "The teachers here care for you and your work. They know your potential and keep pushing you to do your best."

At Vanguard, students explained the connection between students' close relationships with their teachers and their learning. One said, "The closeness between students and teachers showed me that I had potential, that I could succeed at what I want to do. Learning at Vanguard is the way that teachers should be taught to teach -- get close and go in depth."

Another commented: "*J*, my math/science teacher instilled drive in me to do good and not settle for less. He made me want to graduate high school. I was really motivated."

A third, who was eligible for the most restrictive special education setting, said about his experience at Vanguard, • I was bad all the way back from elementary and junior high school. I would have got lost in the system. I would not have made it. I would have dropped out. I needed someone to be there to show they care about me for me to be motivated."

Another CSSC student pointed out the degree of access students have to their teachers, "Teachers give you their home phone number [a common practice across the schools]. They help you with homework, give you advice, and just talk to you [when at home and in school].•

Landmark and Vanguard students echoed their CSSC counterpart, underscoring the importance of access. The former stated, "Teachers give you their phone numbers so you can call them to discuss problems. You might go out for lunch with them."

The latter said, "They trust us. I have all the phone numbers of my teachers. I call if I need help with my homework. When I'm home I'm not alone. Every student has one or two teachers they can turn to for help. If you are struggling, you can go to them and they help."

Vanguard's Gonzalez commented on the academic benefits of trust between students and teachers: "A lot of what takes place in our class and what [students] achieve is based on trust. If they feel safe and trust me they will go that extra mile."

A Manhattan Village Academy student commented on teachers' attention to students: "They take out individual time for you. There is always a chance if you need their help. If they are busy they stop to help you."

A student at Manhattan International explained, "If we have personal problems, like depression, we can talk to the teachers. That's when the teachers are very useful and very helpful. The teachers know us really well because we always work together, one on one. Most of the students have confidence in the teachers."

A Manhattan Village Academy student who had to move out of her family's home discussed the support she received from her teachers:

> Teachers helped me when I moved out of my parents' house. Even through the summer, the teachers were there for me. They taught me to be independent. They encouraged me a lot. They showed me that I could make it in life, that I have the potential to do what I want, that I can strive for what I want. They are there for me. Now they are helping me to get into college.

Another Landmark student said, "Teachers try to be our friend. They try to see us as individuals and they want us to trust them and come to them with problems."

Another Manhattan Village Academy student explained, "I was pregnant last year. The teachers were really behind me. I am still in school and I'm doing good in my classes. The teachers are really behind you here. They push you. They want you to graduate."

Another student at Landmark commented, "Teachers and peers are always here for you. There is always someone here for you."

Another remarked on the benefit of being known: "Everyone knows everyone. Because you know everyone, you know when someone is not themselves and has a problem and you try to help them."

Students notice caring in how teachers teach. A student at CSSC mentioned that "teachers are creative and engaging to help us learn."

At Vanguard a student remarked, "Teachers work around the differences in how kids learn to help you complete your projects."

In each of the schools students commented that teachers did not assign only textbook work. As one put it, "You get to create 3D models, do research, and exhibitions. You do projects. You come up with your own topics and problems. You create the questions and answer them. You write theme, plot, and character essays. You do visuals. [The teachers] don't want it to be boring for you."

At every school, students noticed that their teachers stay late. At Landmark, a student explained, "Teachers come in early and stay after school. Teachers open a lot of time to students."

At Vanguard, every student we interviewed remarked that their teachers stay at school until 7 p.m. to help students complete their work. Several added, "and they don't have to do that." Teachers' dedication makes an imprint. Students are touched. They comment that it makes them want to do more than they otherwise would.

One student at CSSC said, "Teachers here are very dedicated to students. One met with a student over Thanksgiving break to help him draft a college essay." Students at MVA believe that dedication is a requirement for a teaching position at the school.

Caring relationships extend to students' caring about their learning environment. One MVA student exclaimed, "This is my first school where the kids get mad at each other for writing graffiti on the walls!"

William Ling, principal of Manhattan International High School, explained how collegial relationships among teachers and the opportunities to work closely together strengthens accountability: "Everyone holds each other accountable for meeting the [school] goals. The clusters work together on the year's goals. They plan together, discuss kids together, they observe each other, and they support each other's development."

Newman corroborates Ling's perspective:

> The team structure is important to how we support students' learning. At [Brooklyn International] four teachers are responsible for 75 students. That means that teachers know their students well. We have 2 hour team meetings every week. Some weeks we have additional hour. Teachers really spend that time talking about kids. Teams of teachers also meet with the guidance counselors regularly so there is a lot of communication about kids. The team organization makes teachers have to be responsible to each other.

Most colleagues in their own as well as other Project schools find that the team organization offers them the opportunity to strengthens collegial bonds and professional community. One Brooklyn International teacher remarked, "On the whole, we reflect a lot on what we do."

However, they are not romantic about the potential shortcomings of this type of organization and critiques suggest that schools and the school system need remedies when teams cannot resolve problems. One Brooklyn International teacher explained, "Teams are great when they work, but when they don't, they are terrible. One incompetent teacher can bring down a whole team."

School as an Intellectual Community

The central design principle of the Project schools is not structure, but Meier's idea that education is about powerful ideas and that school structure, curriculum, instruction, and

assessment must be organized to facilitate and ensure intellectual development and the development of an intellectual community of students and faculty. Evidence that schools emphasize intellectual development is most apparent in the curricular centrality of intellectual habits of mind, in the schools' unabashed goal to send all graduates on to college, and in their efforts to offer only a college preparatory curriculum to every student. In every school we studied, all of the students we interviewed informed us that their school expected them to go on to college, and in fact, they told us, most of the graduates did go on to college. A closer look at instruction, curriculum, assessment, interventions, and professional development in the schools revealed some of how the schools enact their intentions.

Instruction

Since one size does not fit all, if teachers aim to help all students use their mind well and to prepare for college, it becomes necessary for them to use multiple instructional strategies so that students have multiple entry points into the matter under study. In other words, multiple instructional strategies can increase students' opportunities for success. In all of the schools, we observed teachers using diverse instructional strategies: whole class recitation, guided inquiry, small group work including collaborative tasks and discussions, independent work, projects, experiments, book and Internet research, constructions, technology integration, arts integration, and teacher interaction with individuals and small groups. Students attended to short term tasks as well as long term projects, some rote activities as well as activities that elicited resistance to the demands for in-depth understanding.

Observations and interviews across the schools revealed that small group work is common. In a Manhattan International algebra class multi-language groups of students worked

on word problems while recording new English words to review with their teacher who moved from table to table, to guide groups who asked for her help.

Similarly, in an MVA math class, students worked on problems in small groups. In an interview, humanities teacher, Hope Haskes and math teacher, Jodie Filler said that pair-learning was also common at the school.

Landmark humanities teacher, Jeff Mihok and his colleague, Stephen Cirasuolo, whose areas are math and science, described pedagogy where teachers facilitate student engagement with

challenging content. Cirasuolo said, "At certain times I do the talking. But more often we focus on giving assignments to kids and having them explain the assignment and demonstrate it."

Mihok stated:

> We have been trying to make projects where students produce work that is authentic; for example, a studio project where they make a visual display on their learnings on religion and they make questions that they and other kids need to go to the hyper studio spot to answer.

One of CSSC's humanities teachers explained:

> We want students to do independent work and work in cooperative groups. We get them started and they work independently. Teachers circulate among the groups. We have had success with students working this way. For example, we did an overview of Asian geography project. Students self selected into groups, did research, close reading, individual writing assignments, posters, and presentations. Each presenting group had to teach the class what they learned.

A snapshot of a math class at Fannie Lou Hamer Freedom High School illustrates the kind of authentic pedagogy and active learning for which the schools strive and their efforts to engage students in intellectually demanding tasks. These ambitious goals are of particular significance for students at schools like Fannie Lou, who, because they live in the most

impoverished communities, previously have attended among the lowest performing schools in the state which tend to have the highest rates of uncertified teachers (Darling-Hammond, 1996).

There are 20 students in five groups of 3 to 5 in this math-science block. The class is doing an activity from the Interactive Mathematics Program, known as IMP. Using a washer, thread, and tape, students construct a pendulum and collect data on the speed or period of the swing. Students begin to record the data. The teacher explains the lesson saying today they are not really going to explore all the variables that affect the swing. The goal today is to work on accurate measurement. To this end, he has a model of how they should record (e.g., 2.31 or to the millisecond) on the blackboard. He circulates among the different groups. Students set up their pendulum and start measuring the swing. One group uses a girl's watch which isn't a stop watch and doesn't have a second hand. Quickly they realize that this won't do and start looking around the room for other options. The researcher gives them her watch. They start timing each swing, repeating this for 10 tries as instructed. When they finish, they take their results to the teacher. When he finishes with another group, he turns his attention to them. They've done it wrong. Rather than counting each swing 10 times, they are supposed to record the time it takes the pendulum to swing 10 times, repeating this procedure 10 times. "Ah-ha," they say and off they go.

Meanwhile most of the other groups are working. There is lots of laughter in the room as the students yell at each other to stop timing. One group does not seem to be doing much and the teacher returns to them often. Looking around the room, one can see 4 groups engaged in this experiment, with pendulums swinging from desks, door jams and chairs. The students are engaged, watching carefully, recording carefully, learning about taking samples, and working in a

group. Later they will discuss different variables and move to construct a formula for height, distance, and speed.

The group with the researcher's watch resumes their experimentation. This time they work fast and seem focused and confident. One boy swings and catches, another times, and the girl records. They track the data, redo tries when the watch was pushed at the wrong time or the string given too much push. They start paying attention to the variability in the process, trying to hold the times constant. Again, all but one group seem to be actively engaged. The one that's not is still setting up the pendulum and asking the teacher tons of questions.

The teacher goes to one of the other groups to observe their process. They have repeated the experiment a couple of times already and so he moves them onto experimenting with the length of string and to see how that affects swings. Meanwhile, the dilly-dalliers have finally started their recording. The group with the researcher's watch begins to process their data. The girl does this herself and the boys continue to time swings just for fun. She calls them over to ask a question about averaging, and they don't know. She goes to the teacher, who shows her that her work is wrong because she didn't round off properly. One boy jumps in and explains rounding-off and they set to work on processing the data again. Although they seem a little exasperated at each of these false starts, they seem to accept their frustration as part of the process and continue plugging ahead.

After half an hour, most of the groups have finished recording and are moving into shortening string to see how fast the swing gets. The group with the researcher's watch measures their original string at 30 centimeters --they decide to work in centimeters rather than inches, "that's what [the teacher] likes, right?" They plan to redo the experiment at 25 centimeters.

When asked how much difference they think five centimeters will make, one boy responds, that it should make it swing faster, which is true. While they are constructing their second pendulum, a girl wearing a walkman wanders over to them. She tells the girl in the group that today she's "chillin'" and not doing anything in class. She was in the slow-to-get-started group. The first girl says that's not a good idea, she's here, she might as well do something, but her friend just swings her head, "no," and wanders off.

As the class time draws to a close, the teacher tells everyone to clean up and that they will continue tomorrow. Several students protest; they don't want to leave.

Curriculum

The curricular orientation of the schools provides evidence of their commitment to a college preparatory curriculum. Vanguard's Brown said, "The curriculum has a heavy emphasis on reading, writing, and revising."

At Landmark, Cirasuolo explained that there are "heavy doses of reading and writing in math/science. All topics culminate in a big project which students explain in writing. They do a lot of reading and presenting where they explain orally."

As one would expect in a college preparatory program, the theme of reading, writing, and revising reverberates across all of the schools. All staff comment on pushing students to do more and more reading. Many classes require research papers. According to teachers, students, and our observations, revision is a way of life.

In our sampling of student portfolios, we found that students had read or studied works by the following authors, among others: Brecht, Ibsen, Chekov, de Maupassant, Richard Wright, Morrison, McCourt, Tolkien, Sanchez, Allende, Marquez, Poe, Steven King, Margaret Mitchell,

Shakespeare, Arthur Miller, and R.L. Stevenson. In social studies, students have opportunities to study controversial issues through topics such as political prisoners, the U.S. Constitution, immigration, and Supreme Court cases. Some schools use curriculum such as the American Social History Project, designed to challenge students to approach content from multiple perspectives. In science they can study biology, aerospace, the environment, chemistry, and physics. The arts are often integrated into other subject areas but students also have opportunities to take course in different art forms. For example, at Landmark, students study dance. At Manhattan International and Vanguard students may take ceramics courses or video production.

In another strategy, schools prepare students for higher education by making arrangements for students to enroll in courses at local colleges. These experiences enable students to learn first hand what demands college will make on them and to also test their mettle. One student's account of his experience in a modern American history course at a college in the CUNY system is typical. He said:

> At first I was ready to quit because I felt I was not ready for it. But when I talked to my teachers, they gave me advice on study habits -- how to manage time better, especially for doing homework for both my school and the college courses. I spent more time reading the books. If I didn't understand, teachers here would explain the material. They gave me other books. I took the mid-term and did O.K. It gave me insight on what college would really be like.

In terms of preparing students for college, Butz, says:

> We demand a lot of work. In the 9th grade students work on an autobiography which emphasizes writing skills. In the 10th grade there is an inter-cultural project where we teach them research skills. They must use 3 sources, respond to specific questions, and make comparisons. We have done it 3 different times and we think we have finally done it right.

The schools' curriculum is also often designed to have real life application. One MVA

teacher said:

> We try to relate historical issues to the present day and have them form an opinion. We connected the 4th Amendment right to locker searches when a book bag was stolen. We discuss individual responsibility and what you want the government to take over. We discuss and debate to get them to develop their thoughts one step further.

MVA's Nathan Dudley explained:

> We want students to have the opportunity for personal involvement, to put themselves into the different projects. For example, they do their autobiography and they create their own civilization. Kids are interested in projects because they have the opportunity to be creative. It keeps them engaged.

At Fannie Lou Hamer, students learn math skills in the context of planning a playground.

In social studies, they read *The Powerbroker* to learn about Robert Moses and take

excursions into the community to assess whether he did indeed do damage to the Bronx.

At CSSC, a science class, explained one teacher:

> tries to simulate the work done by environmental consulting firms: they identify a problem, make a plan for how to study it, do field work, and write up conclusions. Another class did a project with Central Park rangers, who are short staffed, and identified tree samples for them. This is real world, meaningful work.

A humanities teacher at CSSC discussed making curricular connections among history, fiction, and contemporary life:

> Last year we did a study of Latin American with a focus on the Dominican Republic. We read Julia Alvarez's *In the Time of the Butterflies* to look at the extremes the dictatorship went to. We then went up to Washington Heights and interviewed senior citizens who had lived through this period. These interviews were powerful learning experiences for our students.

A Landmark student explained, "A lot of us work and bring what we learn here. We also apply what we learn here. For example, I do Spanish tutoring in the school. My Spanish teacher recommended me."

As a Brooklyn International teacher said, "It's harder for students to be passive."

But as Dudley cautions, "Not all take advantage of this opportunity. Some set limits for themselves."

Assessm

Although the schools use multiple forms of assessment including tests, portfolios or performance assessments are the schools' most powerful form of assessment and they are most frequently mentioned by students as their most powerful experience at their school. The portfolios are not merely evaluation instruments. Rather they are complex learning experiences that engage students in what Fred Newmann and colleagues (1996) refer to as *authentic achievement*. They are long term projects that require students to construct knowledge and to engage in disciplined inquiry, and they have value beyond school. Through the portfolios, the schools can require students to organize information, engage content in depth, demonstrate analysis and a sense of audience, communicate elaborately in writing, problem-solve, and finally, make a cogent oral presentation and defense before an audience. While there is variation in the level and quality of the portfolios and the presentations, our observations and interviews indicate that all students struggle to produce them, and it is their accomplishments in combination with the triumph of students and teachers' persistence that makes the experience powerful (Ancess, 1997). Over and over, students remarked that their potential became manifest to them. Following are some students' comments on the portfolio experience:

> "Portfolios make us show what we know, explain what you learned."
>
> "You have to emphasize what you've understood, why you answer a certain way. You need to explain it."
>
> "When you take a test, you don't feel like you need to know it after it is done. The portfolio stuff sticks in your brain better."

"Portfolio is good. It makes you develop writing more. It makes more sense for us to have to do an oral presentation, to answer oral questions about our work to see how we learned English. Tests are not as good for us."
"You get to do most of the thinking when you work with your portfolio. You have to explain in detail how to do something or why something is important, so that someone who doesn't know it can understand it."

"You take the role of the teacher."

"You explain what you know so that someone else can really understand it."

"You have to manage your time to do the portfolios-- manage before, after, and during school."

A snapshot of 11th grade portfolio presentations on American immigration that occurred at Wings Academy illustrates the demands the process makes on students, particularly students who have been under-served in low performing schools prior to their present school enrollment. Three students make presentations on an immigrant group they have not before studied. Prior to this presentation, each has written a 12-15 page research paper on the immigrant group they have studied. Each presents a different section of the study. The committee of assessors first read the assignment, which requires the students to report from an empathetic perspective. Then the committee members read the papers.

The presentation is on Irish immigration to the United States. The first student explains background history on Irish immigration. She offers Queen Elizabeth and the repressive penal code and the potato famine in 1846 as reasons for immigration. As evidence, she refers the audience to a citation in her writing about how people suffered in Ireland during this time. She asks, the committee, "Can you get a sense of how horrifying this is?" The committee members nod. Then she directs attention to a photograph, telling the audience, "Look at the picture carefully. I want everyone to get a feeling for what it was really like." She presents statistics on

how many people left Ireland, how many died at sea, etc. She moves onto a description of the conditions on ships to the US, compares them to slave ships. Her presentation is clear and very articulate. She is an engaging and dynamic speaker.

The next student is much more visibly nervous. She is discussing settlement patterns of the Irish once they get to the US. She describes the competition among various immigrant groups in the US. She speaks too softy and too rapidly for the committee to really understand her. Her presentation moves from topic to topic. It is hard to follow and she screeches to a halt. She sits down and puts her head in her hands. She knows she didn't do well.

The third student discusses the treatment of the Irish in the US and connections to other immigrations. Being Catholic causes the Irish problems in England and US but, she explains, less severely in the US. The Irish had to take low paying jobs in the US, but not all immigrants were poor and uneducated or suffered from the stereotype of alcoholism. "The problem of stereotypes persists today," she says. She continues to describe the wretched conditions in which Irish immigrants lived and draws connections to African Americans and Latinos today. She says that she didn't expect the Irish to have endured conditions like indentured servants and that Irish immigrants were less respected than Blacks. She reads a quotation from her research as evidence. In effect, it says, that if a slave owner lost a slave, down went an investment. Losing an Irishman meant you had to get another one. "Now this quote really hit me," she says.

Next, the first presenter discusses the part of the report on extraordinary people. She gives an account of the Carroll family and Charles Parnell. She compares Parnell to Pedro Campos. The second presenter then reports on the arts. She explains that the assignment asked them to choose a book, poetry, or art related to immigration. about the subject. She has chosen

Beyond the Melting Pot by Glazer and Moynihan. Although she mispronounces, "Moynihan," she recounts what the book is about. At one point she stumbles over a word in a section she reads aloud. The teacher helps her through before the word has been said. This suggests that the teacher has worked with her in preparation for the presentation and knows where she may need support. The first presenter reads a song about fighting for freedom and the third student again shares a photograph on the conditions of Irish immigrant life. They pull the presentation to a close by saying they hoped the committee learned something.

With the presentation completed, the committee begins the process of questioning. One teacher asks for more information about Charles Parnell, which the first presenter supplies. Next a committee member asks for an update on the relationship between England and Ireland today. The students briefly discuss the peace treaty. Another teacher asks how the Irish got the potato. The first student knows: the Indians. The committee continues with its questions: "Why do you think Ireland was overcome by England?"

The first presenter answers, "The English army was bigger, stronger."

A committee member asks, "What's the difference between Protestants and Catholics?"

The first presenter says, "That's a good question." None know the answer. Another teacher questions her use of the word, "respect," when she said that there was more respect for Blacks than Irish. The student responds that respect referred to Blacks as an economic commodity not as persons. This teacher follows up by asking if the slave ship comparison is also fair. The student qualifies her response by saying that it is in terms of conditions (e.g., hygiene etc.) but not in terms of brutality and cites her textbook as evidence.

The teacher asks, "Why are the Irish successfully integrated and Blacks still discriminated

against?"

The first presenter, who is responding to most of the questions, reads a quotation from Lincoln. The tone of seriousness in the room is palpable. The student continues that not all the Irish who came here were poor.

The committee then retires to evaluate the presentations by completing the rubric.

At other Project schools we have seen individual students defending their portfolios according to a similar process. At Vanguard, a recently decertified special education student presented his history portfolio on the role of Japan during World War II. His use of maps, his command of the geography of the time, and his knowledge of the politics of imperialism are impressive. At Landmark, a student deconstructs his development as a writer and reader over the course of his four years at the school. He flips on an overhead projector, and using acetates with diagrams, he takes his committee through his development as exemplified by references to particular papers he wrote over the four years. Using the overhead projector and his acetates, he graphically compares and contrasts his current knowledge to his former ignorance, which the audience can see as his earlier and later papers are in parallel alignment. He makes a similar presentation on the changes in his capacity to analyze literature and in his literary preferences. His analysis and logic are tightly constructed. Without interruption for 40 minutes writer—beyond the time specified in the presentation rules—the student makes a clear and reasoned argument on his development as a reader and. His familiarity with the material, his fluency, his grasp of nuances, and his knowledge, mark him as a confident learner. The researcher thinks that this would make an impressive presentation from a college sophomore. In all cases, committees that include teachers, students, and sometimes external assessors question presenters, score the

presentations according to the school's rubric which embodies its habits of mind and standards of quality, and present their evaluation to the students.

Interventions

Because student access to challenging curriculum and assignments does not automatically translate into student capacity to succeed at such opportunities, smart schools provide many regularized formal and informal interventions that help students negotiate their demands (Ancess, 1997). We found evidence that multiple forms of interventions are integral to the intellectual weave of the CCE/CCSP schools we studied. Interventions are of two types: 1) formal and 2) informal (Ancess, 1997). Formal interventions are structured into the organization of the schools. One variety includes structures such as advisories, house, and family group that enable teachers to systematically monitor students' progress . Landmark has an advisory system which meets 5 times per week and stays together for one year in 9th and 10th grades and 2 years in Senior Institute (11th and 12th grades). Louis Delgado, founding principal of Vanguard High School explained that Vanguard's "advisories support students in their academic and emotional growth. We have 23 advisories with ratio of 13 students to 1 adult." This arrangement, says Delgado, "Puts the students and one adult together so they get to know each other well. It enables us to develop that push and pull relationship to help the kids academically."

A snapshot of Vanguard co-director, Marian Mogulescu's advisory suggests the family nature of these mechanisms. It is 8:15 a.m. and eight students are at different seats around several rectangular tables placed together to form a single large square conference table. One girl reads *The Crucible.* Another is writing. Another reads a science chart that has a narrative and drawings on pollution. Mogulescu reviews a fine arts portfolio in dance with another girl.

Three girls are engrossed in conversation. Another two are preparing for their portfolio presentations. One reviews her note cards. The other takes notes on cards from her report. Two girls bend into the doorway. One asks Mogulescu, "Can we have a word with you ourselves? Two minutes? Or one?" Mogulescu excuses herself from the student she has been coaching and steps outside the room to meet with them.

"At Landmark," Cirasuolo explained, "the main goal of advisory is support for improvement." He explained the mechanism's capacity for intense scrutiny of student performance:

> Kids have the 4 of us -- we have daily conversations and know how they are doing. We contact parents. The advisor takes major responsibility. We may call in Sylvia [i.e., the principal], but [in contrast to conventional school], it doesn't get passed to the office to take care of kids' performance. It stays with us.

At Manhattan International, Ling described the school's weekly 70 minute cluster class, during which a teacher and students "discuss a range of issues such as the code of conduct, drugs, and school expectations, but also use that time for additional classroom support."

Some of the schools have hired personnel such as social workers and counselors who make professional counseling accessible to those who want it. At Manhattan and Brooklyn International, counselors are consultants to the clusters and collaborate with them to craft interventions for students who are having problems.

Another of the structural variety of intervention is instructional. For example, students are taught the skills they need to develop and will be expected to apply. Mihok explained that because writing is integral to Landmark's instructional program, "We help students learn to do brief and longer writing pieces."

Because reading is integral to any college preparatory course, MVA, offers a special class

to students who need support in reading. The class is designed to develop their reading skills and their confidence in themselves as readers. As Butz described earlier, students are taught writing skills in the ninth grade and research skills in the tenth grade. These skills are taught in the context of actual projects the students produce. In ninth grade they produce an autobiography and in tenth, they produce a research paper. In the process of learning to conduct research, students are taught how to collect data from texts and computers. They are taught how to organize their data. They are taught the conventions of research such as compiling a bibliography and using multiple forms of documentation. They are taught formats for report writing.

Sylvia Rabiner, founding principal of Landmark High School, described interventions that are built into Landmark's curriculum. When students enter the ninth grade, immediately they are taught how a library works so that they can use if for their research. They are taught how to do a research paper. They are introduced to the habits of mind and rubrics that will be used to assess their work as they progress from grade to grade and ultimately, their graduation portfolios. They are taught how to do exhibitions so that by the time they defend their portfolios, they have had several years experience in oral presentations.

Almost all of the schools make time available after-school so that students can do their work, obtain help and improve their performance. Some have Saturday programs. Butz stated that the portfolio experience demanded this. Bronx Coalition Community has a Saturday school, which was described by one faculty member as: "Three hours with peer tutoring and individual attention to help students complete portfolios."

Ling mentioned Manhattan International's after-school peer-support program in

humanities and math. The school also offers a 50 minute math workshop early in the morning. Vanguard also has a peer-tutoring program. Brooklyn International offers peer tutoring before and after school and math and literacy programs after school. Newman stated that the library and computer lab were open before and after school for students to use.

Some of the schools secure external resources to support students. Vanguard collaborates with school volunteer program to help students the with SATs, writing, and math skills. This occurs during school hours and on Saturdays. They collaborate with Sisters with Choices (SWC) and Educational Alliance. Delgado explained, "SWC has connected with 15 female students. They meet with them and provide group counseling and tutoring 3 times a week. They are mentors -- all are women of color. They are role models -- professional women, lawyers and entrepreneurs."

Informal interventions, although conducted on an as-needed basis, are as integral to the culture of the schools and as important to the effective functioning of the schools and the students as are the formal interventions. Teachers at all of the schools volunteer their time after school to help students. Vanguard's Brown said, "Most of the staff are here beyond hours. It's almost impossible for kids not to stay here after school hours."

Landmark's Cirasuolo explained how informal interventions are extensions of formal ones: "We look out after our advisees in all of their classes. Our conversations are informal but it gets them back in the groove if they have fallen out."

Landmark's Winifred Patterson, a humanities teacher said, "Kids are looking for teachers' feedback on their work to improve it. The personal relationship -- the conversation does this."

Fannie Lou Hamer students and teachers explained that they work together after school. One student commented, "They push you. If you don't do what you're supposed to do, they are on you. In junior high, you passed regardless. Here if you don't do your work, they hold you back."

In addition to learning their school work, "here you learn to be responsible," said one Brooklyn International student.

Professional Development

Professional development is an important mechanism to support the school as an educational and intellectual community. Although faculty participate in external professional development provided by particular organizations and the Alternative High School Superintendency, the most prevalent and consistent professional development is internal. And it is teachers learning about and from their own and their colleagues' practice. Teachers meet regularly, usually 2 hours a week, to reflect collectively on their practice, to plan curriculum and instruction collaboratively, and to problem-solve pedagogy and student interventions. Delgado described formal and informal professional development:

> Our school is structured so that teachers meet in pairs, or in disciplinary teams, or Senior Alliance teachers all meet together in their groups twice a week. They are parallel programmed so that they can meet. Once a week we meet as a whole staff for 2 hours. And there are many informal, one on one meetings about kids.

Perez emphasized the importance of professional development that mentors novice teachers to "internalize these new modes of teaching." She underscored the responsibility placed on schools, especially if they have a predominantly young and inexperienced staff. Fannie Lou Hamer has a staff development committee to help new teachers understand Coalition of Essential Schools' philosophy and the school's special education techniques and strategies for poor

readers. Teachers at the International schools keep a portfolio of their work, which they and colleagues reflect on. They have summer institutes for collective curriculum development with the members of their network with whom they developed the intellectual foundation of their schools.

Rabiner explained the impact of collaborative professional development at Landmark:

> Here teachers share what they are doing in a formal way in team meetings. They plan together and share what they have done. There is whole school sharing and there are summer institutes where we have more time to reflect. There is more coherence than in big schools where teachers work alone.

These collaborative adult learning opportunities enable teachers to revisit theoretically, practically, and operationally the school vision and goals, students' progress and achievement, the alignment of their pedagogy and the school's goals and student achievement. These collaborative learning opportunities also socialize new staff and novice teachers into the pedagogical culture of the school. When professional development is teacher and school practice, as these schools try to make it, it can expand students' learning opportunities and strengthen the school culture (Ancess, 1998). As Haskes explained, an understanding of community has evolved at MVA as a result of collaborative teacher learning: "Now that the schedule allows teachers to meet, we help each other. We write curriculum together. The variety of work we do with students is greater. We don't lecture."

The Campus

During the planning phase of the Coalition Campus Schools Project, the leaders of CCE secondary schools reconceived the large high school edifice as a multi-age, multi-use building that would house autonomous, small schools at elementary, middle, and high school levels along

with other agencies that provide educational or education-related services. Although the idea of autonomous schools with dedicated and shared space in a single building was initially perceived by the BOE as an anomaly, in fact all of the CCE high schools have shared buildings with other schools. International and Middle College High Schools are located on the campus of LaGuardia Community College where they have dedicated and shared space. Similarly, University Heights High School has space on the campus of Bronx Community College. The Urban Academy and two of the Satellite Academies have shared buildings with other NYC public high schools or private and public non-educational enterprises. Central Park East Secondary School, from its inception, has shared a large junior high school building with Central Park East Elementary School, a District 4 junior high school, and CCE. In fact, all District 4 buildings, where CPESS is located, have for many years been shared by multiple, autonomous, small schools at different levels, each with dedicated and shared space. Classrooms and offices tend to be dedicated where cafeterias, auditoriums, gymnasia, libraries, and school yards are usually shared. Staff, although primarily dedicated to one school, are shared in cases determined by schools. These schools sharing buildings do not necessarily have the same or even compatible educational philosophies, approaches, or schedules. Nor do their leaders necessarily meet or engage one another as colleagues. And although some disagree about building management, the schools function and even thrive. In District 4, irresolvable, inter-school disputes are settled by decisions from the district office.

The Campus model aimed to build upon this experience and sought to improve upon its design. The CCE school leaders envisioned a campus comprised of all Coalition schools to increase the likelihood of collegiality, the opportunity for mutual learning, and compatibility in

building management. This section will describe the organization and governance of the Julia Richman and Monroe Campuses, the role of the building manager, and the accomplishments and tensions of this model

The Julia Richman Campus

Organization and Governance

The Julia Richman Education Complex houses six schools, the Center for Inquiry in Teaching and Learning, the Mt. Sinai Student Health Center, First Steps Infant/Toddler Day Care Center, and The Teen Parent Resource Center. Of the six schools, four are members of CCE: Urban Academy High School, a fourteen year old "second chance" alternative school for students who have been unsuccessful in their previous high schools; the Ella Baker Elementary School, which currently has grades pre-K through 4 but will grow up to 8th grade; Manhattan International High School, which serves only new English language learner, immigrant students; and Vanguard High School, which accepts students residing in the Julia Richman zone. Manhattan International and Vanguard are two of the cohort of six new CCE schools created as part of the Julia Richman redesign. The two non-CCE schools include Talent Unlimited High School, a college-oriented performing arts school and P 226M Junior High Annex, a special education cluster school for autistic students.

First Steps is one of 42 Living for the Young Family through Education (LYFE) programs in the city. The LYFE programs serve children aged two months to three years whose mothers attend high school. The program aims to support young students, who have no access to child care, to continue their education and reach graduation. It also aims to support their development as responsive and responsible parents. First Steps provides day care for the babies

of students in the four Julia Richman Education Complex high schools as well as others in the area. Additionally, First Steps is a city-wide model training site for New York City school-based day care centers (The Julia Richman Education Complex, undated).

The Center for Inquiry in Teaching and Learning is a teacher center that engages urban educators in professional development workshops, seminars, and discussions on issues that confront them and their schools. Offerings range from seminars on classroom strategies for new English language learners, to college admissions, to portfolio assessment, and elementary mathematics. The Teen Parent Resource Center provides professional development and learning opportunities on infant and toddler care and development for staff and parents affiliated with NYC BOE school-based child care programs.

Except for the sixth floor which is occupied exclusively by Talent Unlimited High School, all of the other floors are shared by JREC schools which have dedicated space in dedicated corridors. Facilities such as the library, auditorium, mini theatre, art center, and ceramics studio are shared by all of the schools. On the first floor Ella Baker Pre-K and First Steps Day Care have space along with the swimming pool, the library, the Center for Inquiry and Teaching, the Teen Parent Resource Center, the auditorium, and the Maxine Greene Center for the Arts. Ella Baker Elementary School and the Urban Academy are located on the second floor along with the second floor gymnasium and the second level of the auditorium . On the third floor, Ella Baker, P226M, and Vanguard High School have space. On the fourth floor, Talent Unlimited High School, Manhattan International High School, and Vanguard have space. On the fifth floor, Talent Unlimited and Manhattan International have space along with the school lunch room and school-wide specialty rooms. Finally, on the lower level in addition to the library

stacks, reading and work room, and video room, there are playrooms for the Ella Baker Elementary School and band and practice rooms for Talent Unlimited.

The Building Manager

Building-wide issues are coordinated by the building manager, Herb Mack, who is also the co-director of the Urban Academy. Mack describes the role of building manager as coordinating, facilitating, and scheduling. This was particularly crucial when the schools moved into the building as renovations were occurring. Because Mack scheduled classes for what Ann Cook, co-director of the Urban Academy, calls "swing space," i.e., instructional spaces to which schools could move their classes in order to be out of the way of construction, the renovations were minimally disruptive. Mack chairs the building council meetings, schedules schools into the common spaces such as the auditorium, mini theatre, gallery, and the culinary arts and pottery rooms, but he doesn't tell them what they can do or how to use the space. In other words, in relation to schools other than the Urban Academy, he is an administrative coordinator, not an educational leader. He tries to make sure that the different schools have opportunities to talk to one another frequently and think through issues together without animosity. To this end he "wanders the building to talk to kids." He coordinates security, custodians, and lunchroom staff. He meets with individuals who relate to the building in order to maintain good relations with the neighborhood and local shopkeepers; he "talks to police, talks to local supers, wanders on the street as kids get dismissed to make sure neighbors treat kids well."

Even though the role of building manager gives him added responsibilities, Mack sees himself as a colleague: "You run a school, so you have to be able to work with others as a colleague. We are all trying to do the same thing." His collegial approach supports and is

supported by a culture of shared responsibility, which Mack described:

> Custodians and security are supportive. They work together and quickly with you. The lunch room staff is adaptable. If you ask for help from the other principals, they will help. The athletic director and coach are hard working. There is a lot of good will and people are willing to pitch in.

Many testify to the managerial effectiveness of the collegiality, shared responsibility, and mutual trust and confidence. Ling who readily admits that he was disappointed at not having his own building and resented the placement of his school in the Julia Richman complex, stated, "We are thriving here."

Talent Unlimited High School principal, Ira Shankman concurred:

> In the beginning I had my concerns because I was not part of CCE and I am from a different superintendency. But we are trying to make this an experiment in self-governance, where we make the decisions on what happens. But the complex is working very well. I have to attribute a lot of this to the doggedness of Herb with regard to the building council. We have regular meetings. We decide by consensus. We work to resolve issues.

Lucy Matos, principal of Ella Baker Elementary School noted, "Herb is very, very fair in his approach."

Ling concurred. He has found Mack to be very fair in his dealings with people and schools. "Herb annoys everyone equally," he quipped.

Matos, explained that at JREC, her elementary school is "a presence and an equal partner," which was not the case in another complex where she was an elementary school director.

Callie Biddle, director of First Steps (the LYFE Center), commented that she "is part of a professional community [and has a] more collegial relationship with people than [she has had] in other buildings."

Dr. Marcia Singer, principal of P226M, declared that she likes the building manager position, "especially because the building manager is **not** an obstructionist! I had a previous experience where the building manager was interested in power. This makes for a difficult experience. It was not good. Herb is interested in the programs."

Dr. Margaret Harrington, BOE Chief Executive Officer for K-12 Instruction and Student Services, noted the importance of the Complex• s collegial approach: "The role of building principal [i.e. manager] is delicate and difficult and requires a mature person. Adult relationships require a lot of care. People need to cooperate in new ways. Herb is pulling it together. We hear good things about him. Everyone likes him."

The Building Council

The Julia Richman Educational Complex is governed by a building council comprised of the principals and directors of each school and, as mentioned earlier, is chaired by the JREC building manager. As explained in the brochure for The Julia Richman Education Complex, the council "oversees the needs of the building, its common spaces, general governance and maintenance "so that each school can focus on education" (undated). The council meets weekly for at least one to 1½ hours and makes decisions by consensus.

Matos pointed out that rule by consensus is a labor intensive process because the council members don't always agree and they "are all from different schools and all have different temperaments." Some meetings have lasted for three hours and on occasion, council members have come in on Saturdays to meet. "But," as Matos explains, "We all want this to work for the kids and the staff."

Shankman explained:

> We are the governing body of the building. We deal with all things that affect us. We make decisions for the building. It is done in a mostly collegial manner. The fact that we can meet on weekly basis airs any grievances immediately • like a family • we have to work things out. As long as we keep in mind that the goal is the kids, then things will work out.

Ling confirmed the perceptions of his colleagues: "The directors work well together. We meet religiously each week and work on our problems."

Singer, who, as principal of a special education cluster school, supervises several sites, emphasized the importance of regular weekly council meetings: "You have time to see who you need to see and you know everyone's program. People become more comfortable saying what they need to say to the council. People give their thoughts to one another. Familiarity breeds support rather than contempt."

One meeting provides a snapshot of the building council in operation. At 3:30 p.m. on a November Friday afternoon, the council gathers in a first floor conference room. Seated around several large tables pushed together are Matos, Shankman, Singer, Mogulescu and Delgado, Ling and Manhattan International co-director, Rona Armillis, Biddle, Dena Gabriel director of the Teen Parent Resource Center, Cook, and Mack. Council members chit-chat while they munch on chocolate chip cookies, dip crackers and slices of French bread into small plastic containers of hummus and baba ghanouj, nibble on grapes, and sip cranberry juice or diet cola. Mack passes around the agenda. Items represent issues various members want brought to the table. At this meeting, the council discusses a proposal to finish the basement, fire drills, Christmas presents, funding from the superintendent's office for technology and after school programs, graduation dates for each school, the location of pay phones, security, and socializing new students and teachers into the culture of the building.

Matos presents a proposal for the basement. She has found a company that will custom-make padding in which to wrap the basement room columns so that it is safe for a children's gym. She explains that the room could be used in variety of ways, including Talent Unlimited's dance classes. She proposes that the building pay for the pads. Mack asks for approval of $1,000.00 from JREC fund for this project. The members all approve.

Delgado reminds the council that they have to make decisions on holiday gifts. He suggests mugs and when the council approves, he volunteers to order them. Herb reminds members of reports they need to submit to him. MTV has agreed to improve the auditorium but a report is necessary before they can proceed. The lunchroom needs a report as well. He has asked for graduation dates and only Shankman has responded. There is a district meeting on art which Armillis volunteers to attend for the building. Mack explains that there have been a couple of false fire alarms. He proposes a strategy that does not reward the false alarm, which the members discuss and agree to.

They discuss a concern that students have been running down 68th Street, which jeopardizes what are now good relations with the residential and commercial community. Shankman agrees to follow up. Matos and Armillis discuss the open door to the parking lot. Mack explains that he has asked security and the custodian to keep closing it, since it is often open. Cook says that students are propping open another door. Mack responds that Urban Academy or Vanguard students are responsible. Mack sees this security lapse as an issue of the building culture: "The culture of the building that we try to establish that we are familiar with, new teachers and new kids aren't. There isn't an understanding of why and how we share space. A socialization process needs to occur."

Singer discusses students talking in the lunchroom about her autistic youngsters as *retarded kids*. Matos mentions stones being thrown at windows at 3 p.m. The proprietor of the newsstand has talked to Mack about some thefts which means, says Mack, that the students don't understand the building culture: "We need to think about how to deal with this -- bringing new kids into the culture."

Mogulescu explains:

> When we each came into this building, it wasn't yet Julia Richman. Now it is the Julia Richman Education Complex. At that time, we did stuff to create a community and common goals for the building, retaining each school's independence. We should go back a little but keep some of the gains we have made. There is a mixed message, because we tell kids to keep off other's floors, but we want them to treat the building as a community. The building hums with activity. Now we need to learn from each other's ways.

Cook asks if the schools have any all-school meetings. They do not. Matos suggests that teachers are reluctant to bring everybody together but thinks they need to do it. As it is time to conclude the meeting, Mack responds, "Why don't we come back to this -- about building a community while having separate ones."

The tone of collegiality and the pattern of shared responsibility demonstrated by different school leaders' problem-solving together and volunteering to take the lead for different building wide issues are a source of pride for council members. Shankman explained that they feel they each use their skills and contacts to contribute to the life and development of the building, "to make the building whole." With some help from Cook, Singer and Special Education District 75, contributed a cooking laboratory to the building. Relationships individual school have with members of the business community have also brought significant benefits for all of the children in the Complex. The three level, red carpeted, state of the art early childhood/adolescent/adult

library was co-sponsored by the lawyers, Sherry and Steve Jacobs and Steve Jacob's law firm, Weil Gotshal & Manges, which has a relationship with the Urban Academy. MTV's commitment to refurbish the auditorium with state of the art equipment results from a relationship with TU.

The council's accomplishments are also a source of pride. Two years ago, they agreed to eliminate the metal detectors at the front doors in order to establish a more humane, personal environment. Each school takes responsibility to ensure that their students understand their role in the security of the building. In the beginning when students were making a mess in the cafeteria, the council devised a plan to get them to clean up and it worked. They have invited the three superintendents who are involved in the building--the Manhattan High Schools Superintendent, the Alternative High Schools Superintendent, and the Special Education Superintendent--to a council meeting where they discussed the operation of the building and its underlying principles. Deputy Chancellor Lewis Spence, Board of Education President Thompson, and Board Member Irving Hamer have attended meetings as well.

The tension between autonomy and community

At the heart of the collaboration and collegiality at JREC is a healthy respect for the tension between autonomy and community. Singer explained this tension as a trade-off that requires time:

> There is a trade-off between the good of the collaborative and the good of an individual school in the collaborative. The collaborative looks at the whole because changes in parts affect the whole. This takes time. All of the JREC leaders are innovators, dynamic, strong personalities. This isn't easy to juggle. But we are a match because we all want the same thing. It is important to be part of the school but have autonomy and a vision that I can control for my students.

Ling explained that the schools in a building "need to be separate, have separate

identities. This needs to be inviolate."

Mack explained how autonomy demands cooperation and community, i.e., a struggle for the greater good and compromise for the needs of others:

> Physically, the idea of autonomous spaces is crucial. It allows everyone to have an individualized school and share common spaces. Schools are organized, but as they like. There is basically not a structure for the building. Schools are on different schedules and although it is a problem for scheduling, it is not insurmountable and we work it out. We exist and people respect each other. The kids don't fight. We meet regularly, issues come up, and we get along. We don't all agree, but we don't fight. People are willing to do things that are worth while. There's a feeling that we can build something here that is nice and good for kids. People feel good about things here.

Shankman described the relationship between each school's autonomy and the collective responsibility of the council:

> In the beginning we made a great effort to define our schools as separate entities and not really do business as usual. This is not same as schools broken into seven different parts. Here each school is really different. Each school governs its own area. In the council we look at how that is working.

The capacity of the JREC to manage this tension is noted by Richard Organisciak, the Superintendent of Alternative High Schools who oversees all of the CCE schools in the building:

> The Julia Richman Complex shows remarkable ability to maintain the individual identity of each of the schools but also collaborate with neighbors in the building. They recognize the importance of respecting different missions and visions. It is a testament to group collaboration. The process keeps students in the middle of the work.

Organisciak's observations also suggest that the dialectic between autonomy and community helps schools stay focused on their *raison d'etre*: the education of their students. This theme is echoed by the building's leaders who refer to their own and their colleagues' commitment to make the Complex work for their students.

Evidence suggests that together, the mechanism of a building council and the council member's commitment to a governance process by consensus support a level of confidence and trust among the schools that enables them, individually and collectively, to sustain and use the tension for the common good. Singer asserted, that more than at any other site where P226M is located, her students and her program are a full part and partner at JREC: "We have had a wonderful experience here. It is one of the nicest buildings to work in. We may be different from other schools, but it is safe for us. When it's a match, it's a match."

Nonetheless, Matos cautioned against a simplistic view of what is unfolding at JREC:

> We are still young in our work. This [arrangement] works under certain conditions. You can't throw any schools together. You have to be purposeful about which schools you put together. You have to be careful of whom you put in as manager. I am not sure it would work without Herb. You need a type of dedication, putting time in. Having clear autonomy as schools is very important. When we cross those lines we pay the consequences.

Benefits to individual members of the complex

The members of the JREC claim that they and their students benefit from the diversity, resource sharing, opportunities for professional development, culture of respect, and cross school activities that accrue from their living arrangement. The diversity in the building is seen as a great plus. Shankman noted the respect for diversity among the adults: • I respect my colleagues. We may differ in educational goals, instruction and philosophy, but that does not mean we cannot function as a whole unit." Even though he feels that he must expend time explaining the needs of his traditional school to his alternative school colleagues, who don't always understand, he feels he is a full member of the community and that his voice is heard. As a result, he is committed to the JREC model. He says, • I would like to think that we can be a model for how a complex could function."

Matos observed that "life in this building is for many different types of people -- ages, kinds, abilities, and interests."

Shankman concurred: "Students have a chanced to see a spectrum of learning—elementary school, autistic kids—we eat with autistic kids; we perform for them; they come to all of our shows."

Matos contends that "you change the culture of a school community by defining the population differently. This building is different because it has babies and an elementary school. This influences how kids interact with each other. High school kids soften their manner when they are around younger students."

Ling voiced a similar perspective: "The elementary school humanizes the high school. It is in the nature of every human to protect little ones. The lunchroom is better when [the high school students] see young ones. You don't have to remind the kids-- they try to set a good example."

Matos noted that there is a culture of respect :

> We don't have kids hanging out in bathrooms smoking, or destroying property, or destroying the ambiance of the building. You walk through the building and it's a respectful environment. There is a respect for work. There is a collegial professional community. I sit with my colleagues and talk about what affects us in common.

Sharing resources, which could easily be a source of tension, is also seen as, said Ling, "a plus." He adds, "We have 2 gyms which we would not have had in the building we designed. That means we can have Project Adventure, which is an important part of our program. We have an auditorium, a ceramics center, a dance studio, an art gallery, and a library."

Harrington, too, notes the advantage of resource sharing, "Small schools within the building can share resources and get the advantages of the large size building."

Granger Ward, Superintendent of Manhattan High Schools, observed that bringing together schools of different levels, with different missions, and from different superintendencies created opportunities for collegial learning: "The leaders of the schools go beyond sharing the mechanisms of management. They share instructional methodologies and best practices."

The confluence of different superintendencies and different assumptions about the organization of schools has exposed school leaders to different ways of seeing. Shankman, who would have been able to expand the 400-student TU if he had access to the entire building and who finds appeal in that idea, considers the advantages of small size:

> I say I would like to grow, but I like small also. Kids don't fall through the cracks. When I see a kid I don't know, I know. We can provide services to kids, more individual attention. A teacher can take a kid under his wing. We case-manage a problem. This would be difficult to do in a 1200 or 2000 seat school.

Vanguard staff have also been influenced by the practices of other schools in the building. Delgado asserts that working with all the other schools has strengthened Vanguard's philosophy and pedagogy. Cross-school classroom visits by Vanguard staff have been useful to teachers, who have adapted some of the practices they have observed.

The presence of different schools also offers students opportunities for cross school socialization and learning. Ling mentioned that students date across schools. They all do internships or community service at Ella Baker, P226M, or in the LYFE program. The younger students have access to role models and the older students have the opportunity to be role models. Matos observed that the schools are constructing more opportunities for inter-age-inter-school interactions: "Now we have reading buddies. Later interactions will be around performances. Little kids have homework tutorials with bigger kids in this building. They have escorts. We do community service with the high schools." The council agreed to form JREC

sports teams that would draw together students from the different schools and is considering some instructional opportunities to engage for students in activities across schools. One such initiative planned is ceramics.

Harrington commented on the success of JREC: "Julia Richman has a good model and it works. . . . Outsiders perceive that it is working. It's quiet and it's working."

The James Monroe Campus

Organization and governance

The James Monroe Educational Complex began with four high schools, 2 of which were CCE schools under the supervision of the Alternative High Schools superintendent and 2 of which were not CCE schools and under the supervision of the Bronx High Schools superintendent. The CCE schools that were in the original Monroe campus cohort are the Bronx Coalition Community School for Technology and the New School for Arts & Science. The two schools in the Bronx Superintendency are the Monroe Academy for Business & Law and the Monroe Academy for Visual Arts & Design (A&D). Business and Law, explained principal Judith Murphy, uses an interdisciplinary approach to learning to focus on those skills and attitudes students need to succeed in the world. The mission of A&D, as stated by principal Leslie Gurka, is to prepare students to use their creative abilities in life and society. To this end, the visual arts are integrated into the academic curriculum.

As of September, 1998 the New School for Arts & Science relocated to a building occupied by a junior high school, where, according to Organisciak, it will be the lead school and there will be the opportunity to annex a 7th and 8th grade so that it can become a secondary school. World Cultures, an alternative high school that serves new English language learner

immigrant students but is not a CCE member, moved into the Monroe Complex. Currently, one of the four high schools occupying the Monroe Complex is a member of CCE. Additionally, there is a LYFE Center and a health center in the building. There is a building-wide athletic coach, who forms teams with students from the different schools. In the planning phase are an elementary school scheduled to open in September 1999, a teacher center, an art gallery, and an adult literacy center. Because there was BOE as well as building consensus that oversight by two superintendencies was problematic, complete jurisdiction was given to Organisciak, and the Monroe Academy for Business & Law and the Monroe Academy for Visual Arts & Design were transferred into the Alternative High School Division.

Just as at JREC, the schools in Monroe have dedicated space and corridors but share floors. (In fact, the architectural model of both buildings is the same.) The LYFE Center occupies the first floor. The Bronx Coalition Community School for Technology occupies the second and third floors. Art&Design occupies the third and fourth floors. World Cultures and Business and Law occupy the fourth and fifth floors.

Although the Monroe campus design included plans for a building council as the governance body of the campus and although one was established, it has not been operational. The CCE directors stopped attending the council meetings. Initially the building council tried to meet once a week but according to Gurka, it "fell apart because some of the decisions were overturned by the superintendent and the CCE people decided not to go to meetings," a decision, she said, she respects. Superintendents' interventions occurred when the principals could not come to agreement, but decisions tended to be delayed until the superintendents, themselves could schedule a meeting and come to resolution. This breakdown impacted the role of the

campus director, who, according to Gurka, "goes around and does one by one management." Additionally, there is an emergency ad hoc council, mentioned by one of the CCE principals, that enables the principals to meet, and principals interact individually to resolve issues as they arise.

The Building Manager

At the Monroe Campus, the building manager is known as the campus director. Wayne Cox, who has served in the role for two years, is Monroe Campus' second campus director. He was selected for what is a full time position on an assistant principal line through a C30 process that involved a joint interview by principals, teachers, students, and parents representing each of the original four campus high schools. Prior to his position as campus director, Cox was an education administrator in the New York State Division for Adjudicated Youth at the Ella McQueen School in Brooklyn, a state school in collaboration with city.

As originally conceived, explained Cox, the campus director was in charge of all common areas of the campus (e.g., the custodian, health aids, school safety, LYFE Center, and the cafeteria) and liaison to all outside people not involved in instruction (e.g., school construction, school facilities, CBOs, parents seeking information that doesn't relate to one particular school). Since assuming the position, Cox has been developing and redefining the role so that it corresponds to the actual needs of the schools and the campus. He noted:

> These are not cookie-cutter schools. The CCE schools [i.e., Bronx Coalition and the New School] are vastly different even thought they are both CCE schools. They are not different in philosophy, but in the details, like in discipline. The Monroe Academies are different too. I find out the specific needs of schools and learn how to help each school, for example in assisting in discipline. At Bronx Tech I am more involved in settling problems and mediating. In Business and Law it is more hands on. With A&D it is more directing them to the right person.

Cox helps with school budgets and teacher observations. He problem-solves with the faculty of the schools when their principal is not available. As he explains it, he tries to "set the culture of

the campus--of the building--not the schools."

The role at Monroe has many challenges. Because there is no Board of Education line for a campus director and because the campus director was not conceived as the building supervisor, Cox is on an assistant principal's line which makes his status in the bureaucratic hierarchy subservient to the principals'. Furthermore, because the BOE does not fund the campus director, his salary is paid from the budgets of the four schools. According to Cox, the discrepancy between the responsibility and the authority in the role of the campus director results in some inherent contradictions that can create frustrations:

> You get the respect of an assistant principal but then you are called upon to make decisions that affect the entire building. If you want to make decisions for entire building, you need permission. If it gets turned down, the decision cannot affect the entire building. You may get one principal who agrees and three who do not. You can't make an overriding decision because you don't have the authority because you are an assistant principal.

Finding a way to serve the schools equitably also presents challenges because the schools are diverse and have diverse needs. Cox explains:

> Being a liaison is challenging because you are liaison for different people for different reasons at different times. And there is no such thing as parity. You cannot make things equal for all of the schools. It's like having four children -- you can't treat them the same. Each school has its own personality, style, growth rate, needs, interventions, etc. Given that, there is no such thing as being equal.

Cox's greatest challenge was managing the transition from James Monroe as a high school to James Monroe as a campus. The BOE's inability to secure space to hot house the new schools for three years before returning them to the building required the 2 new CCE schools and the 2 new Monroe academies to move in before renovations were completed or Monroe High School was phased out. Cox explained that he had "to help the new schools expand while getting rid of everything from Monroe. It was hard to get people to understand that this was

Monroe Campus not Monroe High School. People had a hard time because it was changing a tradition. This was true of all constituencies." Cox admitted that he too had to understand how the campus model was different from his experience and expectations:

> I had to understand it too. I had to understand what the schools are about, individually which is something I didn't do at first. Then I had to understand how to fit schools into the plans of the campus. I came in and I made changes based on traditional educational [assumptions] and what I knew of because I thought I understood what each school was. I was wrong. I didn't understand the Campus Coalition Schools project. I thought of 4 traditional schools in one building. Even when they said alternative schools, I thought of traditional alternative schools -- second chance schools -- not pedagogically different schools.

As Cox's insights reveal, the CCE/CCSP reform is not merely a change in structure, but a change in organizational culture.

The superintendents raised issues on the problematic nature of the campus director's role as it is designed at Monroe. Joseph DeJesus, Superintendent for Bronx High Schools argued for the campus director's independence and authority: "The campus director should not be beholden to any of the principals. He should be fully funded and have certain other funding for secretary, security, aids, that will serve that capacity for coordination -- maintenance and clerical [tasks]."

Organisciak expressed the need for the building manager to have a level of authority higher than the principals': "Multi-use buildings need to have a building manager and the building manger must have authority to make the final decision."

Despite the contradictions, frustrations, and evolving nature of the campus director role at Monroe, Cox is committed to making the position and the campus work. He is accessible to his constituencies, which, he said, have achieved a level of comfort with him as campus director. He has developed a sensitivity to the uniqueness of the situation and feels that he "can get things done without being overbearing or mean." He has achieved the cooperation of the School

Construction Authority which is responsible for the building renovations.

Harrington comments on his efforts: "The building manager needs to be the right person and Cox has resolved many of the issues."

Strengths of the Monroe Campus model

Murphy, Gurka, and DeJesus mention four benefits to the Monroe model: small school size, school choice, sharing resources, and sharing instructional strategies. Murphy says that staff know students better at small schools. She believes that the different schools offer students zoned for Monroe a choice of schools which otherwise they would not have.

Gurka explained how practices at Bronx Coalition Community and the New School influenced Business & Law and A&D: "After talking to [the principals of Bronx Coalition Community Tech and the New School], I did some interdisciplinary humanities and some teacher exchange with the New School." In one case, an A&D teacher, who had been impressed with a New School poetry display, visited the New School teacher's classroom to learn how the teacher elicited poetry from students. After the observation, the teachers spent some time in discussion. Bronx Coalition Community and the New School, which dismiss early one day a week for professional development, have influenced Business and Law and A& D to do the same. Both academies voted on a School Based Option to dismiss early on Wednesdays for professional development.

Gurka and DeJesus commented that resource sharing is another advantage of the model. The schools share the cost for some extra curricular activities, enrichment, and a librarian. Gurka feels that if there were only one school, there would be none of the special features, such as the teacher center, which are being planned. DeJesus explained that the schools have shared art and

science teachers. He said, "They have cross school activities and student activity affairs. There was a school sharing day where kids went across and shared art and business activities and the like. They have hired a coordinator of student affairs to plan campus activities." The schools also share a librarian and the LYFE center, which is available to the students of all 4 schools.

Tensions

The campuses and the schools encounter both internal and external tensions that affect their development and performance. This section will discuss some of the tensions that have affected the development and performance of the campuses, the schools, and the intentions of the Project.

Tensions Presented by the Campus Model

We found six issues that created tensions affecting campus development and function: 1) space, 2) size, 3) governance, 4) capacity to tolerate diversity, 5) capacity for compromise, and 6) resistance to change.

Space

As Ling pointed out, campus partners must resolve their disappointment at sharing a building with other schools, especially if they had hoped to have autonomous space. Even when, as at Richman, the building partners find their way to a commitment to do what is necessary to make the building work for each of the schools individually and collectively, the disappointment is not an easy hurdle to surmount. Ling commented:

> Sharing space can be an obstacle. We can make a schedule for ourselves, but it must jibe with the other schools and their needs. It is a matter of being able to collaborate. We collaborate across schools. Now it works well. Initially, it was an obstacle. The building council is very helpful. We have all responded positively to working together and the building works. We genuinely like each other.

At Monroe, Murphy commented on the need to adjust to "not having my own building."

The difficulty in transcending this territorial entitlement seems rooted in the systemic conflation of school and building and perhaps the unexamined expectation that being a school principal means having one's own facility. Building ownership is symbolic of autonomy and emblematic of the public education culture of privatization: i.e., the unquestioned expectation that once you close the door to your classroom or your school, you are in charge and accountable only to yourself. In buildings that are shared, privatization is impossible. Everyone is exposed.

For Gurka, space tensions have a practical edge that create obstacles to collegiality: "the struggle for rooms is constant. Each person in leadership focuses on their own needs."

An issue related to space is renovation. In order to prepare these single school buildings for "condominium" style education, so that the schools within the building have autonomous space, such as their own offices, storage, and labs renovations are necessary. In both buildings renovations were not completed before schools moved in. At Monroe, renovations interfered with school functioning and instruction. Murphy explained:

> Major renovations have not yet been done. For example, storage is horrendous. I don't have any storage space. I needed a computer lab and there was not any electrical support in the space we reserved to handle all of the computers and programs. I am not yet able to get Internet access. The [shared building] concept is doable, but the building needs to become more user-friendly 'What are the schools going to have? Who needs what? How will they get it?' Life would be easier if changes had been made prior to the start of the school.

According to Organisciak, "Renovation is the key difference between Richman and Monroe. Unfortunately they are taking very long [at Monroe]. [Richman] doesn't have to contend with the physical demands at Monroe. They can focus on instruction and attention to kids." However, when renovations were occurring at the Richman complex, the availability of "swing space"—unassigned space—in the building prevented the disruption of instruction

because Mack could reassign classes to rooms that were in unaffected areas.

Campus size

Competing priorities within the school system keep school and campus size a battleground for schools that aim to be small. The BOE's need to secure seats for the constant flow of students competes with the campus' need to develop a human scale environment capable of producing quality education that does not repeat the overcrowding errors of the failed schools and building models they are intended to replace. One Julia Richman Campus administrator said, "We were charged to solve the education quality problem, not the space problem."

The BOE has pressured the schools and campuses to increase their enrollments, arguing that their spaces are underutilized. They determine the level of building utilization by assessing its square footage against the number of students enrolled. Although the BOE's utilization formula is based on a factory model schemata of education and although the CCS Project is intended to transform that model, the BOE applied it nonetheless. One superintendent attempted to persuade one school leader to increase the school's enrollment to 116% capacity because the school's average daily attendance was 84%. According to the square footage formula, argued the superintendent, space would be available because 16% of the students would be absent each day.

CCE also pressured the campuses to comply with the BOE's demand to increase enrollment. When the Monroe schools agreed to increase their enrollment to 400 students per school and the Richman building council rejected the directive, Priscilla Ellington, CCE executive co-director, urged them to comply explaining that some BOE officials questioned the lack of uniformity across campuses and CCE could not rationalize the difference in their negotiations with the BOE. Competing perspectives reflecting different and conflicting values,

agendas, and understandings of the variables that affect pedagogy generated tensions between the campus and the intermediary organization.

Governance

Although the Richman campus has a functional structure for building governance, as all school leaders attest, they continuously work at it and at their commitment to it. Time is required because regular meetings are essential and must be a priority for all of the building leaders if the campus is to work. As Matos' comments imply, the schools in the building are compatible enough. As Ling has stated, the school leaders fundamentally like each other. As Singer has said, there is a match, and while it is professional, the personal cannot be ignored. Although the schools belong to three superintendencies, they are unified in their commitment to self-governance and building accountability, they brook no external interference, they guard their autonomy, and they risk fighting BOE policies that they feel are not in the best interests of their students, schools, and the building. When the Alternative High School Superintendency assigned the complex a computer teacher, whom the building council rejected after finding him unsuitable to the schools' needs, the BOE rescinded the position. When the CCE co-directors, Priscilla Ellington and Heather Lewis intended to negotiate with the BOE for increases in the enrollments of the Julia Richman Complex CCE schools without consultation and consent, the building council enjoined them from representing the schools outside of the presence of one of the principals.

The Monroe campus is in the process of finding its governance structure. BOE officials have expressed their belief in a collaborative hierarchical model with the campus director charged with making final decisions. In order to support the evolution of the building, the BOE

has given oversight authority to a single superintendency.

At both campuses the BOE has not funded building-wide positions. As a result, the campus director's position at Monroe is paid for out of the budgets of each of the schools. At Richman, the Urban Academy absorbs the cost of the building manager. Other positions such as a librarian are also not budgeted. Those we interviewed interpreted the absence of budget as an absence of support. One individual said, "You are expected to do the new thing the old way."

Capacity to tolerate diversity

The original CCSP proposal called for the campuses to be comprised of only CCE schools so that CCE could take responsibility for the rehabilitation of an entire building. However, both campuses have schools that are not members of CCE and that are based on other assumptions about the operation of schools. The differences create tension and demand tolerance and flexibility, if not understanding. Shankman explained:

> As a specialized school, TU has needs that other schools can't appreciate because they are not arts schools and it is a fight to get the needs understood. But that's part of living with a family. There was a problem because common spaces could not be scheduled except on a daily basis. We are on a 5 day schedule and we are the only school [at Richman] like that. We needed to have a dance studio on a 5 day basis. That was ceded to us. So things worked out.

The Richman campus, where the majority of schools--four of the six-- are CCE members, may experience less tension than the Monroe campus where originally, two of the four schools were CCE members and currently, one of the schools is a CCE member. Unfortunately, as one superintendent remarked, the four Monroe campus principals split along that affiliation.

Principals and district administrators also report that differences in school philosophy, superintendents, and personalities have created tensions. Harrington explained the complexity:

It• s difficult to get people to cooperate. [We] are looking at the relationships among

> principals, how different views Monroe principals have on what a school is and how it should operate affect their functioning and the development of the schools as a building. [We are looking at] how do they manage and share the health aid, Public School Athletic League (PSAL), and security. How does each school in the complex share and maintain a separate identity? The two superintendencies have made it difficult for the building to unify around these and other issues such as turf, who controls money, the need to foster the idea that everyone must be concerned about serving all of the children in the building. Richman works. Monroe isn't there yet.

Despite the tension, proximity to the CCE schools has had the unintended benefit of influencing the assumptions and practices of the non-CCE schools.

Capacity for compromise

Our findings at the Julia Richman campus suggest that each school's needs must be met for the building to work. Cooperation demands a win-win situation that precludes competition between schools and between educational models. Each school, regardless of what any one thinks, must be respected in the building, must feel whole. This means that each school in the building must function well enough to earn the respect of the others.

Competing needs as well as competing and conflicting ideas created tension at Monroe. DeJesus explained:

> There is a sense that collaboration is a one way street, • I will collaborate with you, if I agree.• There was a situation regarding security and PSAL [Public School Athletic League]. Monroe High School had metal detectors and scanners. Business and Law and Art and Design wanted to maintain the scanners. The Coalition schools never wanted to have scanners. It [became] an issue when they moved in. But Monroe High School was still there and Monroe had to have scanners. The understanding with PSAL was that there would be campus teams not individual school teams. One of the CCSP principals would not let her students try out. It took the superintendent's intervention for her to let kids try out.

At Monroe, the BOE's commitment to implementing organizational features of the proposed campus model, e.g., the elementary school, has had unintended consequence of disenfranchising the majority of schools in the building. While the superintendent has described

the BOE's collaboration with CCE to plan the building, the Monroe academies have not participated in those conversations or in the decision-making. One principal explained that based on her experience with incoming 9th graders, she would have liked to discuss the possibility of expanding her school to include 7th and 8th grades in order to strengthen students' skills for high school success, but she did not have the opportunity.

Resistance to change

At both campuses there has been resistance to the changes required by the campus model. Adjustment to the transformation of Richman from a single school to a campus was particularly difficult for those teachers who, after the phasing out of Julia Richman High School, joined the faculty of Talent Unlimited, which, prior to being a school, was a program at Julia Richman High School. Shankman noted that many of those staff members were resentful and resistant to the new, campus organization. However, "Now that they see things are working," he remarked, "almost all have come around."

At Monroe, Harrington believes that starting up elsewhere is at the root of some of the adjustment problems: "Hot-housing created problems at Monroe. If you have to live with each other from day one, you work out the problems."

Despite the tensions at Monroe, DeJesus, Organisciak, and the principals expressed optimism. DeJesus said:

> Although [among] the four schools there is a level of unease about the security issue -- scanning vs. non-scanning, [about] what is done relative to discipline and security, how effective people are in maintaining discipline, and [about] the instructional program, there is a level of understanding.

Gurka expressed a growing commitment to making things work: "We support one another if we need things. While we may not always agree in philosophy, it's not personal."

Organisciak commented, "Monroe is still evolving and defining [itself]. The school community is starting to understand the need to work collaboratively. The schools need to continue to understand the importance of collaboration."

Tensions for the Schools

In addition to the normal tensions of new schools growing up, such as finding the time for school and teacher development, the schools have concerns about autonomy, support, student admissions, and staffing.

Autonomy and support

The issue of school autonomy, i.e., the authority and freedom of practitioners to make the decisions that are in the best interests of their school, is a source of tension for the schools, especially as it relates to size, space, assessment, bureaucratic paperwork, and the press to conform to traditional expectations. Individually, the schools are experiencing the same tensions around the issues of size and space as those confronted by the campuses. The superintendent wants the schools to increase their population because their space is "underutilized" and the school system is overcrowded. One principal explained the BOE's lack of understanding: "We are utilizing space differently from the way the former high schools used it." Because the principals have been subtly threatened with implied charges of insubordination, most have complied with the mandate to increase their enrollment (Ancess, Henning-Piedmonte, Ort-Wichterle, & Rodriguez, 1998).

The State Education Department's new policy to require Regents exams for high school graduation imperils the schools" pedagogical autonomy. Currently, a variance granted by a former Education Commissioner exempts the schools from the Regents Competency exams, but

it is a temporary solution. The BOE, the Chancellor, and his Deputy for Instruction have been strong and pro-active supporters and partners to the schools' efforts to develop a performance assessment alternative to the Regents exams that will be acceptable to the current Education Commissioner. Because the portfolio assessment system used by the schools is integral to their instructional program, curriculum, teaching, and professional development, a discontinuance of the variance is likely to compromise the educational foundations, coherence, and integrity of the schools. Considering this study's findings that the portfolio is the most powerful educational experience reported by the majority of students interviewed, its elimination as a high stakes assessment is likely to undermine opportunities for student learning and success, particularly students whose learning is not adequately assessed by conventional measures. The comments of one school leader capture the level of tension felt by most: "What is hanging over us now is the imposition of Regents without any commitment beyond the waiver. I don't sleep nights over this. If we are forced in this direction it will absolutely alter what we are doing with portfolios • they are incompatible."

A number of individuals commented that the transformation of the Alternative High School superintendency into an increasingly traditional superintendency has altered their level of autonomy. One individual commented that the current superintendent represents the BOE where the former superintendent represented the schools. One teacher said that there was increased pressure to comply with bureaucratic regulations that conflict with the educational mission of the schools:

> We have more people coming from the superintendency to check on what are we doing, which in terms of school reform means that you're responding to someone else's vision of what the school, what all schools should be, rather than building a school in a particular vision. And our vision at its best was that your job was to teach children to use their

> minds well, and that you needed to get close to kids to do that. You needed to have a particular relationship with a particular set of kids and over time to build a particular culture. And that's not what we're looking at here.

Another teacher stated that the Superintendency had ordered them to schedule a set number of minutes for each subject area, daily, even though they were in weekly compliance with state guidelines. Such mandates dictate the school schedule and limit the instructional options teachers have as well as their capacity to make educational decisions based on the needs of their students. They undermine the teacher commitment needed for student success.

School leaders asserted that they are required to complete excessive amounts of paper-work, which they feel is irrelevant to the functioning of their schools. Since school leaders are unable to both complete the paperwork and be active instructional leaders, accessible to staff and students, and engaged in the daily details of the life of their school, they feel pressured to hire administrators to do the paperwork when they would prefer to hire teachers who provide direct services to students.

Many feel that they are no longer supported as alternative schools, that what is different about them is no longer valued and accommodated. They see the transfer of the Monroe Academies from the Bronx High School Superintendency to the Alternative High School Superintendency as evidence that the idea of "alternative" lacks meaning. "We need people in the High School Division and [in the school] system to understand better what we are about," said one school leader. "They do not. No one from the new sup's office or the Chancellor's office has visited my school. They can't understand the work we do and help us if they haven't seen it. They need to know who we are."

This sense of rejection by the BOE is confirmed by Robbie Klein, retired BOE official for

student admissions to high school:

> The uniqueness of the [CCE/CCSP] schools has not been institutionalized at the BOE. It is not recognized. The BOE sees the CCSP schools as being outside the system -- not serving kids as they see them needing service. There is a philosophical difference between the Project and BOE. The BOE deals with mandates and law suits. Schools that set their own rules are boutique schools.

Although student outcomes indicate that the schools have honored and continue to honor their end of the bargain, assuming greater accountability for the educational success of their students, the BOE and the State Education Department's intensified resistance to increasing their autonomy, to recognizing their achievements in ways that allow and encourage the work to flourish, ensures that these reforms will remain small scale, reaching only the few students who have the good fortune to attend schools where faculty are willing to wage the unending battles necessary to implement these reforms. As Michelle Fine has said, "If the system doesn't relent, these schools may go under."

Student admissions

The current student admissions policy does not provide potential students with the information or opportunity to make informed choices about the CCE/CES schools. Students are assigned to the schools without understanding that portfolios will be required for graduation. Those students who want a traditional education must transfer to another school and disrupt their education. In an informal survey, Delgado determined that those students who selected Vanguard for its educational orientation performed better than students whom the BOE has randomly assigned. In order to be responsible, the schools divert resources to support students who are ambivalent about their requirements.

Staffing

Although the schools can and do use the School Based Option to hire staff appropriate to their needs, school leaders report that the number of experienced teachers prepared to implement the innovative pedagogy they require is not commensurate with the scaling up of innovative schools. One teacher remarked: "The teaching staff that you could hire ten years ago for alternative schools was a much smaller and more intellectually driven circle. As the number of schools has grown, you're drawing from a wider group of teachers. There's different experience and different expectations from teaching."

A second tension, mentioned by one school leader, is the prospect of "losing trained teachers through bumping." Although the schools have hiring protections through the School Based Option (SBO), a contractual agreement between the BOE and the United Federation of Teachers that allows school staff to hire the teachers most qualified to implement their mission, they are not protected from losing qualified teachers when more senior, untrained teachers are excessed from other schools. This consequence occurs because the BOE has scaled-up the SBO reform without modifying contingent policies and structures that continue to place teachers' seniority rights in competition with the pedagogical needs of schools. Therefore, when the school system is in an excessing mode because student enrollment has dipped and it has too many teachers, contract agreements make teacher seniority, not school-specific pedagogical qualifications, the determinant of who stays, who leaves, and who transfers. This particular issue highlights the incompatibility of these new model schools and the system that regulates them.

The Role of the Center for Collaborative Education

The Center for Collaborative Education, which was founded by Deborah Meier and a

small group of like-minded practitioner colleagues, developed when there was a city and state policy environment conducive to the learner-centered vision and practice of education that their schools had pioneered and that was embodied in the principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools founded by Ted Sizer of Brown University. However, in mid-1990's the appointment of more regulatory state and local education leaders created an educational sea change. Meier, who had recently retired from her principalship at Central Park East Secondary School, left New York for Boston to start a new, K-8 public school. Shortly after, long time superintendent of alternative schools, Stephen Phillips was asked to resign. The collapse of this phalanx of support was a severe blow to the security of the school reformers.

Meier's departure brought to the leadership of CCE the organization's two executive co-directors, Lewis and Ellington, who previously had provided Meier and the organization with important administrative and advocacy back-up and had taken responsibility for organizational development. As explained by a teacher at Coalition School for Social Change, the departure of Meier, who was the first school practitioner to be honored with a MacArthur *genius award* and who had achieved national prominence, "left a huge education and political leadership vacuum that no one could have anticipated." Although Lewis and Ellington had a history of involvement in pubic education in New York City, it was as parent activists, not educators. Neither had school practitioner or professional experience in education. They and the schools had two formidable challenges: 1) transforming what was often known as "Debbie's organization" into a viable establishment that could survive the loss of a powerful founder and 2) responding to a new city and state policy environment which both supported and resisted practitioner-driven reform.

The role of CES/CCE principles in school development

CES/CCE is founded on the following set of principles:

1. The school should focus on helping students learn to use their minds well;
2. Students should master a limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge. Less is more should dominate; curricular decisions should be guided by the aim of thorough student mastery and achievement rather than by content coverage;
3. The school's goals should apply to all students while the means to those goals should vary;
4. Teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum feasible extent. The goal should be that no teacher have direct responsibility for more than 80 students;
5. The dominant pedagogical metaphor should be student-as-worker and teacher-as-coach;
6. The diploma should be awarded upon a successful final demonstration of mastery for graduation--an exhibition, not for credits earned for seat time;
7. The tone of the school should be of "unanxious expectation" and decency;
8. The school governance structure should collaborative;
9. Students, faculty, and parents should join the school community by choice;
10. The school should reflect racial, ethnic, intellectual, and economic diversity;
11. The school should be committed to family and community involvement, trust, and respect;
12. Budget should target staffing for personalization and collective planning (Sizer, 1984; CCE, n.d.).

In our interviews almost all respondents commented on the powerful and enduring educational influence of Meier and the CES/CCE principles. Butz said, "The ideas and ideals of the Coalition are the underpinnings of our life."

Rabiner commented on the constancy of these principles: "The underlying principles remain sound. Teachers continually go back to them. They are the undergirding of our instructional program. They have provided the direction for the school."

Delgado remarked, "The principles mean everything to us. We always begin with the philosophy and look at how we are implementing it in the classroom. We struggle with it but are very committed to it."

Repeatedly, faculty from CCE/CCSP mention small class and school size,

personalization, curriculum integration, portfolios, and habits of mind. Vanguard teacher, Brown explained, "We talk about habits of mind and we use some of the rubrics, which we are changing. One of the basic thrusts is making sure we are small and having teachers talking to each other."

Comments by a teacher at Fanny Lou Hamer, suggest that these educational principles have been internalized: "CCE has articulated principles that have influenced us and what we do. The habits of minds have been a good influence on kids. But if CCE were to disappear, we would still have that."

In order to support the intellectual development of all students, all of the project schools have adapted the Central Park East Secondary School (CPESS) habits of mind. In their work, the schools require students to weigh evidence, express awareness of multiple perspectives, make connections, speculate on alternatives, and assess the value of phenomena. The continued strong presence of these habits of mind as the central, organizing principle of instruction and of performance-based assessments across all of the schools in the project is testimony to the power of Meier's influence and the commitment to the belief in intellectual development as the essential purpose of education.

The Role of CCE

From the perspective of Project members, CCE plays three important roles: support, fund raising, and advocacy-intervention, especially with the BOE. CCE/CCSP members interviewed expressed different perspectives on support from the organization. One principal in the Bronx cohort described the effective intervention of CCE at Monroe as critical to her school's educational commitments:

> CCE was instrumental in developing the best plan for the building. When we moved to Monroe, the building was a mess. CCE intervened. We got beautiful 4th floor painted classrooms. The floors were stripped. Currently CCE is working overtime with the new Superintendent on policy issues surrounding our assessment and graduation portfolios. Without CCE, for me and my school, we would have to become more focused on how we could continue our teaching styles and still prepare students for the RCTs and Regents and the fight for waivers.

Monroe Campus Director Cox also described effective support by CCE's for his role and the building plan:

> Heather and Priscilla are supportive. They are supportive based on "why." If something changes in this building that we had made plans for and it wasn't supposed to change, they say, "why." If I feel that things aren't right and nobody is listening to me, they say, "why." When people interject into my realm, they say, "why." It is good to have someone ask, "why," when you needed that question answered and couldn't get it.

Teachers at Fannie Lou Hamer, Landmark, CSSC, and Brooklyn International, who participate in Eiffel Project, commented that they found the professional development CCE sponsored useful for integrating technology into their curriculum. One of the teachers at Fannie Lou remarked, "CCE has played a major role in Eiffel and we have benefitted a lot in terms of computer equipment." Almost all of those interviewed appreciated the funds emanating from CCE as a result of the Annenberg Challenge and the Eiffel grant. The funding enabled schools to continue programs and services they would otherwise have had to disband. These included arts programs, foreign language courses, tutoring for the SAT exams, and after- and Saturday-school programs.

Most of those interviewed, particularly those from the Manhattan cohort, contrast the organization's current support with the support provided during Meier's leadership. A teacher at Fannie Lou Hamer explained: "The influence of CCE has lessened since Debbie Meier left. Their influence with the BOE has lessened. People say CCE can't protect us."

Butz pointed to a correlation between changes in CCE's influence and changes in the policy environment: "When we first opened, CCE was a very dynamic and influential force. I feel the influence is waning. I think they are reeling from the change in policy and trying to find a direction. It's like we all got caught in this vortex."

Mogulescu recounted a change in intellectual leadership: "When Debbie was there, the conversation was about ideas. It was intellectual. That conversation is gone now. We are talking about procedures, not ideas. We need to talk more as small schools, to share and develop our beliefs, and to share how we implement them."

Ling suggested a lack of clarity in CCE's role:

> In the initial stages, CCE was there with financial, political, and intellectual support. Debbie, Eric [Nadelstern, principal of International HS at LaGuardia Community College], Steve Phillips and CCE had to do a lot of work behind the scenes for this [effort] to work. I didn't feel I was not being supported. We felt we had autonomy in creating our schools. Now CCE's role is less clear. I feel very vulnerable at this stage.

Delgado noted a conflict in priorities between the majority of CCE/CCSP members and the executive co-directors:

> They [CCE] dont understand what we are struggling with. CCE has a priority of getting access to the Board of Ed and their priority seems to mean that they compromise our needs and desires without consulting us. There are discrepancies that don• t sit well with the practitioners. These are critical times and we need to be united and we are not.

Rabiner• comments suggested the instability created by changes in organizational leadership:

> Initially there was very strong support from CCE and moral support from Debbie and Steve Phillips. We had dinner meetings with Debbie. I still call her. Debbie had tremendous credibility and a wide network of friends like Sobol [former State Commissioner of Education]. She was willing to fight. You never felt Debbie was afraid of anyone. We got support from Nancy Mohr [retired principal of University Heights High School]. CCE reached out a lot in the early years. It doesn• t feel like that support is there now. There is a sense of feeling more alone. We have gone to CCE with our

> issues, but I am not clear what their role is in supporting us. We brought admissions and ed-op issues. CCE brought Robbie Klein [now retired BOE admissions official] to a meeting [to discuss admissions]. We never got feedback since that meeting. We are not clear where CCE stands--will they fight with us or do they have another agenda? The issue is, what is CCE• s real role for us in our organization apart from funding money?

Rabiner's comments draw attention to the organization's internal and external educational and political credibility and its will and capacity to advocate the agenda set by the schools. They suggest the tensions emerging from the co-directors efforts to transform the organization from a practitioner-driven, membership organization to a staff -led education reform organization.

Without the intervention of CCE, faculty from two schools experiencing leadership crises expressed a sense of diminished support. In one case, the new superintendent voided the former superintendent's agreement with the staff to replace their departed principal with two teacher-directors. Instead, he appointed an interim principal. The faculty expressed concern that an externally imposed interim principal who had a different vision for their school would make changes that would undermine their desire to continue according to the vision they had developed with their former leader. One teacher leader said: "I know that we turned to CCE. I don't know that they were tremendously helpful. I think it's a shame, when we need that kind of a body." Faculty reported conflict with the interim principal over performance assessments and students schedules, which were inconsistent with CES/CCE principles for intellectual development. Several teachers transferred and the school was destabilized.

At a second school, the faculty demurred from asking for CCE's intervention in a long standing conflict with their principal because they doubted that CCE would be impartial. One of the teachers explained, "We thought about asking CCE for help, but we really thought that all that would happen given [the principal's] alliances was that we would be told it was our fault, or

we were a very difficult staff."

Although the Alternative High Schools Superintendent reported on CCE's advocacy efforts on behalf of small school size and performance-based assessments, the majority of CCE/CCSP schools find that CCE's positions on these issues do not reflect their own. CCE co-directors advocated for a uniform enrollment cap of 400 students despite the objections of at least seven of the ten CCE/CCSP schools who argued that they could not provide quality implementation of their instructional programs unless their enrollments were sustained at 300 students. For example, Delgado commented:

> The pressure for us to increase our numbers to 400 is creating a lot of tension at our school. We need the 20-1 ratio to struggle for the quality we want -- we will start to compromise what we are struggling for. With 400, we will lose our staff and we will compromise our educational mission. I can't do this. They are starting to destroy what we are trying to build. For so many of our kids this is their only stability, the only place where they have some caring adults.

When schools demanded intervention on the issue of school size, (the entire faculty of Fannie Lou Hamer signed a letter to the co-directors on the need for CCE to develop an organizational strategy), CCE suggested that the schools individually discuss their enrollment with the superintendent and then let them know the results. Without intervention, schools were left to fight the issue in isolation which diminished their chances of winning their struggle. Although the BOE withdrew its formal policy to increase school size, the superintendent mandated individual schools to enlarge their enrollment by as much 100 students over a period of two terms. As a result, classes are larger and teachers are concerned about the impact increased size will have on serving students. At Vanguard, Gonzalez commented:

> Our numbers in classes have gone up. This is extremely difficult to handle. If we want to keep teaching the students the way we want to teach at Vanguard, having a large number of kids in a classroom is not going to work. If we want to assign writing and have

> [students] revise, then the numbers must remain small. When you start going over 24 we have to dilute our exhibitions and writing assignments because it is too much for teachers to grade. It gets out of control.

Her colleague, Chumpitaz, said, "If there are so many kids, we can't keep track of everyone -- what they are doing. More have to do the same thing. You can't diversify the assignments."

Unfortunately these disagreements have caused deep divisions within the organization and resulted in CCE withholding support from schools. Several principals in the Julia Richman complex report that CCE support to the building was cut off after the principals insisted that one of them be present at BOE/CCE meetings to ensure that their positions were correctly represented. Despite invitations to openings of the JREC library and art center and events at the teacher center, no CCE official attends.

When 7 of 10 Project schools (and a total of 16 of 20 CCE high schools) joined the state-wide New York Performance Standards Consortium because they felt it had developed a graduation assessment protocol more suited to their needs and work than the one developed by CCE, the co-directors refused to support them or to collaborate with the Consortium.

The turmoil troubles all factions as schools express an increasing sense of vulnerability. As one teacher remarked, "In this [school] system, you have to fight to stay hopeful. This makes the schism tragic because the existence of CCE, that feeling that we are part of something larger than ourselves, that there is a movement, can help you feel hopeful." The combination of the policy sea change and the organizational identity crisis leaves many in the Project feeling unsure about the future of their work and their schools .

Implications for Replication.

Our findings indicate that the Project has had a number of successes. The CCE/ CES Project's aim was to pilot a practitioner-driven reform of two comprehensive, zoned, failing urban high schools by creating and hot-housing a set of new small schools and by re-imagining the big building as a multi-age, multi-service education campus, into which some of the new, hot-housed schools would return. Seven years later, all of the schools in both cohorts have graduated their first class and the Manhattan cohort has graduated its second class. All of the schools are small size and are organized for teachers to know students well and to implement learner-centered pedagogy that aims for the intellectual development of all students. All of the schools developed performance-based assessment systems and require students to complete a portfolio process in order to graduate. Despite changes in education politics and policy and in state, city and (in some cases) school leadership, the schools have created a foundation for providing under-served, urban youth an intellectually powerful, college preparatory education. Two large, comprehensive, zoned, failing high schools, Julia Richman and James Monroe, were phased out, and their buildings are at various stages of transformation into multi-age, multi-service education campuses. Support from and collaboration among CCE, the BOE, private foundations, and the United Federation of Teachers have made a substantial contribution to these outcomes. The Project schools are rethinking, revising, and refining their educational programs as is possible only after they have begun to graduate students. The schools have come along way and they have yet a ways to go.

If the project is to be considered for the reform of other failing high schools, we suggest attention to the following matters: 1) the issue of practitioner driven reform, 2) the structural and constituent composition of campuses, 3) policy discontinuity and system level accountability, 4)

the structure of support and oversight, and 5) reconceptualization of the zoned school.

Commitment to Practitioner-Driven Reform

Typically, education reforms tend to be programs designed by "expert" outsiders and imported by school practitioners who ostensibly want to improve their schools. In contrast, the CCE/CCSP reform intends to be practitioner-driven. In other words, the reform takes its direction from the knowledge base of practitioners. As such it frees those doing the work from the rigidity of imported packaged programs to be responsive to the flow of the feedback from their unique contexts. Evidence indicates that those aspects of the reform that have been led by practitioners are achieving their purpose. New school staffs have applied the knowledge base of experienced practitioners such as Meier, Nadelstern, and Mohr and adapted the CES/CCE principles and the CPESS and International models to support instructional programs that rely on personal relationships and promote intellectual development. Where the schools in the educational campuses have designed the building governance structure, such as at the Julia Richman campus, they have been able to work together as a team and to take collective responsibility for effectively managing the building as well as supporting cross-school collaboration and individual school autonomy. All of the campus schools benefit, as we see at the Julia Richman Educational Complex, where the building council has increased building safety and expanded resources and learning opportunities for all of its students.

However, we find that the BOE's policy on practitioner-driven reform has been ambivalent and inconsistent. Different administrations and different administrators have provided different levels of support for school and building autonomy on issues of school size, performance assessments, school leadership, and school organization. Where the BOE has been

active in campus development, it has supported a hierarchical model of building governance. Where the BOE has disagreed with the building council's decisions it has challenged or superceded them. No budgetary or financial support has been provided for building positions. Yet, the BOE acknowledges the campus as a successful model of reform and our student outcomes analysis confirms this assessment. We suggest that the BOE adopt a stance of "top down support for bottom up reform" to support increased practitioner autonomy where practitioners desire it. We suggest that the BOE analyze those issues that put its needs to serve students into conflict with schools' needs to serve students and that it reformulate relevant policies in order to craft win-win resolutions to what are the enduring competing priorities that generate these conflicts. It seems to us that the BOE will continue to encounter the conflict between the need for student seats and the need for academic excellence for all students. The satisfaction of one should not require the sacrifice of the other. It is unlikely that the BOE's goals for social justice and equal access to excellence will be achieved if system-wide logistical concerns continuously take precedence over and compromise opportunities for quality education, especially for those students who have been historically denied.

CCE's position on practitioner-driven reform is also not clear. We found a pattern in which CCE withheld support when practitioners took the lead, especially if practitioners' lead conflicted with or supplanted the organization's lead. Support was withheld from the Julia Richman campus after the building council asserted its authority over CCE to ensure their accurate representation to the BOE. Support was denied to the customized performance assessment development of seven of the ten Project schools; and support was denied to the Performance Standards Consortium.

The membership's position on practitioner-led reform is also not clear. Different members in different schools and in different cohorts want different levels of autonomy. These differences need to be acknowledged as do the differences in school comfort with and capacity for autonomy. This ambiguity has contributed to internal organizational conflict, deep divisions, and alienation. We suggest that the CCE membership revisit their organizational expectations for and understanding of practitioner-led reform and develop strategies for supporting the range of needs and perspectives among schools.

The Structural and Constituent Composition of the Campus

Originally, CCE proposed all-CCE school campuses. Logistical and political, not educational, considerations dictated the placement of non-member schools on the campuses. Considering the complications created by the degree of differences between member and non-member schools and their effects on the function of the campus, this issue should be revisited.

The BOE has honored its commitment to implement the components of the campus model presented to them. They are making an effort to ensure that the Monroe campus has the same features as the Richman campus. We suggest that these good intentions to create a standardized model be revisited so that the design of a building can be responsive to each building community's needs and goals. It is important to note that some of the features which were troublesome at Monroe, such as oversight by multiple superintendents or unfinished capital renovations, were benign at Richman. Instead of a standardized model, we suggest that CCE consider developing a set of guidelines for campus development that build on the Richman and Monroe successes and that aim to ensure the implementation of the organization's educational principles. We also suggest that CCE identify those conditions, skills, and competencies

necessary for the development and function of a practitioner-driven, collaborative campus that also sustains individual school autonomy.

Two features at the Richman campus that may have been particularly helpful to its development and might be considered as a condition for campus development include: the presence of an anchor school (e.g., the Urban Academy) and the mix of experienced and new school leaders (Urban Academy co-directors, Matos, and Singer are experienced school leaders). It is worth noting that the Mack, Cook, Matos, and Singer also had prior experience leading schools in buildings they shared with other schools. At the beginning, according to Cook, the stability of the Urban Academy enabled them to take on major responsibility for the building freeing the new schools to focus more on their need to develop.

Lastly, in any expansion of the Project, we suggest that the consideration be given to Peter Senge's thoughts about replication: • I do not believe great organizations have ever been built by trying to emulate another, any more than individual greatness is achieved by trying to copy another "great person" (1990, p. 11). Instead, consideration should be given to articulating, unpacking, and understanding those principles upon which schools constructed their successes and how other reformers might make use of them.

Policy Discontinuity and System Level Accountability

As stated earlier when the CCE/CCS Project was initiated, city and state regulatory agencies fully supported the set of innovative pedagogical policies and practices that define the project schools, such as small size, organization for low student-teacher ratio, and graduation by performance based assessment. In fact, without this level of support from these agencies, the Project could not and would not have been initiated. Administrators, teachers, parents, and

students selected these schools for these innovations and were assured of systemic support for them. However, despite public and private financial, professional, and personal investments in these innovative schools and despite an emerging evidentiary base indicating their success, they are unprotected from the vicissitudes of the regulatory agencies that oversee them. Because new administrations are under no obligation to honor the commitments made to schools by their predecessors, no innovation, no matter how successful, is secure. Any SED or BOE administration can and does supercede the decisions of preceding administrations without consideration of the consequences to schools, practitioners, students, parents, and their own credibility with the community of foundations that fund innovation.

Such fickle organizational behavior raises questions of system level--i.e., BOE and SED--accountability to parents and students as well as the educators who choose these schools for their educational practices. It takes so many years to initiate and bring reforms such as the CCE/CCS Project to maturity that unless their intellectual capital is protected from the shifting winds of educational policy, critical opportunities for enduring reform, particularly those that increase the chances of success for under-served youngsters, will be squandered. This tradition of policy discontinuity undermines practitioner commitment and schools' efforts to stabilize professional standards of practice, pedagogical expertise, a culture of accountability.

We see this dilemma being played out now. Because the performance assessment graduation process is a core and transformative feature of CCE/CCSP schools, many involved in the Project are deeply troubled by the current SED administration's plans to eliminate local performance assessments as the basis for graduation. The BOE has supported some of the core features of the schools such as the performance-based assessments, but has eroded others such as

schools' rights to determine the structure of their leadership. According to most in the Project, the Alternative High School Superintendency, which former Chancellor Anthony Alvarado created in order to support non-traditional schools and programs and which for almost 20 years has been a guardian for their integrity and a buffer against encroachment by the system, has become the instrument for their disintegration. The current leadership of the superintendency are former big high school principals who are skeptical of the values the schools embrace.

We suggest that the BOE and the SED engage in a public conversation in response to these questions: When administrations change, what is the system's responsibility to the constituencies that have chosen educationally respectable innovations, that have chosen schools that succeed differently? If continuity cannot be assured, how can a system be responsible?

The Structure of Support and Oversight

As discussed in the *Inching* report (Darling-Hammond, et al, 1997), the BOE is not adequately organized to support innovation. In the past when innovative schools were few, it supported them with "policy by exception" (Darling-Hammond, et al 1997). As a result, innovative schools were marginalized. At this juncture, the BOE is trying to pull innovative schools into the mainstream through a policy of regulation and standardization that has the effect of denying their differences. Neither approach provides effective support or oversight. In different ways, both approaches make the schools invisible with the result that supporting them creates conflict for the school system. The Deputy Chancellor for Operations has advocated the solution of a differentiated system, which needs to be aggressively explored. Additionally, we suggest the consideration of charter campuses.

The Reconceptualization of the Zoned School

One CCE/CCS Project goal was to develop schools that could more effectively educate those students who were attending zoned high schools. The student-outcomes study indicates that the schools are achieving this goal. However, the BOE's high school admissions process needs to consider students' educational preferences for the schools' innovative practices, prior to, not after, their enrollment. We recommend that the BOE and the schools collaborate on an admissions policy that serves zoned students and that is also respectful of students' educational preferences and the schools• educational commitments, prior to students' admission.

Conclusion

The BOE's Dr. Harrington has pointed out that the CCE/CCS Project, along with other school reform initiatives, has clearly impacted the school system: "Without the external work, the BOE would probably not have changed. The BOE is now more sophisticated in school redesign than before." Her reference to "external work," which is actually the work of school practitioners who are **of** the NYC public school system, underscores the important role school practitioners play in system-level reform. Her comments underscore the important impact insider-outsiders have on the status quo, on bureaucratic resistance to change and resilience to innovation.

Harrington knows how schools need to change and why:

> Breaking down anonymity is important in all schools, especially in poor urban systems where kids do not have a support system. Big schools have a hard time doing that. Small schools create a culture that kids buy into and that parents feel is more responsive and [where] faculty feel they can make a difference. But small is not enough. [Schools] need professional development and commitment of staff and commitment of parents and kids that they have to do things differently. We need to create schools where kids and teachers can have relationships. Relationships have to be used to get good academics.

But will that knowledge translate into the policies and resources necessary for its application?

Harrington also knows how the BOE has to change; for implicit in her analysis on school

change is a blueprint for school system change: the BOE needs to create a culture of buy-in to practitioner-driven reform in order to be more responsive to schools that look different and educate differently. If it is to support difference, it needs to do business differently. If it is to be results-driven, as the Chancellor says it is, then BOE officials need to assess school and student achievement based on value-added assessments, not on employee compliance. To force compliance is to eliminate diversity. Just as big schools have trouble being supportive and responsive, as Harrington says, so big systems have trouble being supportive and responsive. As Harrington's comments indicate, the BOE knows what changes it has to make, changes that the CCE/CCSP schools--which are, after all, BOE schools-- have been pressing for since their inception. But will the BOE make these changes?

Epilogue

Recently, an article in the *New York Times* asked whether the "special culture" of Monsanto, a life sciences company "with a nontraditional approach to corporate life [and] policies that are good for people," could survive a merger with DuPont, "the much larger and more traditional chemicals and life sciences company" (Barboza, 3/3/99, p. C1). Monsanto emphasizes a team approach; DuPont has a hierarchical structure. Most analysts are skeptical and history is not on Monsanto's side. Will the Coalition Campus Schools Project -- and other grassroots efforts for school reform -- be the education analog to Monsanto? Will the CCE/CCS Project survive? Will this reform go the way of most reforms-- marginalization or elimination? The story remains to be written.

References

Ancess, J. (1998). *The reciprocal influence of teacher learning, teaching practice, school restructuring, and student learning outcomes.* Paper presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association at San Diego, California.

Ancess, J. (1997). *Making a difference: How three high schools connect disenfranchised youth to their future.* Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.

Ancess, J., Henning-Piedmonte, V., Ort-Wichterle, S., & Rodriguez, M. (1998). *Mid-course findings on the implementation of the New York Networks for School Renewal/Annenberg Challenge.* NCREST Unpublished report.

Barboza, D. (1999, March 3). Monsanto visionary in a cubicle. In *The New York Times*, pp. C1, 3.

Center for Collaborative Education. (n.d.). *A dynamic vision of how schools can drive systematic* [sic] *change.*

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). *Doing what matters most: Teaching for America• s future.* NY: The National Commission on Teaching and America• s Future.

(Darling-Hammond, L., Ancess, J., & Falk, B. (1995). *Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, Ancess, McGregor, & Zuckerman, (1997). *Inching toward systemic reform: How the Coalition Campus Schools are reinventing high school.* National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching. Unpublished Report.

Gladden, R. (1998). The small school movement: A Review of the literature. In M. Fine, M. & J. Somerville (Eds.) *Small schools big imaginations: A creative look at urban public schools.* Chicago: Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform

The Julia Richman Education Complex, (u.d.). *The Julia Richman Education Complex.*

Lee, V. E., Bryk, A. S., & Smith, J. B. (1993). The organization of effective secondary schools. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.) *Review of Research in Education, 19*, 171-268. Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Lee, V. E., Smith, J., and Croninger, R. G. (Fall, 1995). Another look at high school

restructuring: More evidence that it improves student achievement, and more insight into why. *Issues in restructuring schools, 7*, 1-10.

McLaughlin, M. (Fall, 1994). Somebody knows my name. *Issues in restructuring schools, 7*, 9-11.

Newmann & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

New York City Board of Education, division of Assessment & Accountability. (1997). *Assessment/accountability report.* NY: NYC BOE

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. NY: Doubleday.

Sizer, Theodore R. (1984). *Horace's compromise*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE

I. Document Identification:

Title: How the Coalition Campus Schools Have Re-imagined High School: Seven Years Later

Author: Jacqueline Ancess & Suzanna Ort Wichterle

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:2000

II. Reproduction Release:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please check one of the following three options and sign the release form.

V Level 1 - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.

___ Level 2A - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

___ Level 2B - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no option is marked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign Here: "I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Jacqueline Ancess Position:Co-Director

Printed Name: Jacqueline Ancess Organization:NCREST

Address: Box 110, Teachers College Telephone No: 212-678-4193

525 W. 120th St., NYC 10027 Date:Feb. 18, 2003

RC023852

III. Document Availability Information (from Non-ERIC Source):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: NCREST

Address: Box 110, Teachers College, Columbia University
525 W. 120th St.
NY, NY 10027

Price per copy: $12.00 Quantity price:

IV. Referral of ERIC to Copyright/Reproduction Rights Holder:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please complete the following:

Name:

Address:

V. Attach this form to the document being submitted and send both to:

Velma Mitchell, Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
P.O. Box 1348
1031 Quarrier Street
Charleston, WV 25325-1348

Phone and electronic mail numbers:

800-624-9120 (Clearinghouse toll-free number)
304-347-0467 (Clearinghouse FAX number)
mitchelv@ael.org